

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 4.—OCTOBER, 1893.

I.

THE CRUSADES.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

"No idle fancy was it when of yore,
Pilgrims in countless numbers braved the seas,
And legions battled on the farthest shore,

Only to pray at Thy sepulchral bed,
Only in pious gratitude to kiss
The sacred earth on which Thy feet did tread."

—From the German of LUDWIG UHLAND (*An den Unsichtbaren*).

LITERATURE.

For the sources and works on the Crusades see MICHAUD'S *Bibliographie des Croisades*, and SYBEL'S *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs*. From WILKEN and MICHAUD we have the most learned and elaborate histories of all the Crusades; from SYBEL, the most critical history of the first Crusade, with an introduction on the contemporary accounts (1-143).

I. SOURCES.

JAC. BONGARS (b. at Orleans, d. 1612): *Gesta Dei* [we might add: *et Diaboli*] *per Francos, sive Orientalium Expeditionum et Regni Francorum Heroymitani Historia*, etc. Hanovise (Hanau, not Hanover, as given by Hallam and others), 1611, 2 vols. fol. (1206 and 361 pages. A copy in the Astor Libr.). The first printed collection of contemporary reports (chiefly of

the first Crusade) including: 1. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitarum*, by an anonymous writer who took part in the first crusade. 2. *Historia Hierosolymitana*, by ROBERT, a monk of S. Remi. 3. *Historia Hierosolymitana*, by BALDRICH, the abbot, afterwards archbishop of Dol. 4. *Historia Francorum*, by RAYMOND DE AGILIS, chaplain to the Count of Toulouse. 5. *Hist. Hierosol. Expeditionis* by ALBERTUS AGUENSIS (of Aix-la-Chapelle), who introduced the popular form of the legend of Peter, the Hermit. 6. *Gesta Perigrinantium Francorum*, by FULCHER, chaplain to the Count of Chartres and afterwards to Baldwin, the second king of Jerusalem. 7. *Gesta Dei per Francos*, by GUIBERT, abbot of Nogent. 8. *Hist. Hierosol.* by WILLIAM, archbishop of Tyre (WILLERMUS TYRENSIS, GUILLUME DE TYR). The last is the most important.

Archbishop WILLIAM of Tyre (b. probably in Jerusalem, 1130, d. after 1184,) has shaped the accounts of later historians down to the critical researches of von Sybel who has somewhat invalidated his account of Peter the Hermit. The full title of his work is *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestorum a tempore successorum Mahumeth usque ad annum Domini 1184*. It was first printed at Baale under the title "*Belli sacri Historia*," 1540 fol. German transl. (*Gesch. der Kreuzzüge und des Königreichs Jerusalem*) by E. and R. KAUBLER, Stuttgart, 1840 (634 pages). A new Latin ed. in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.*, Tom. 201. French text by M. Paulin Paris, *Guillaume de Tyr et ses continuateurs*, Paris 1879-'81, 2 vols. William is one of the ablest, if not the ablest, of medieval historians, and his work is the monumental history of the first crusade and the kingdom of Jerusalem. He was probably of Italian descent, educated in Europe, familiar with Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew, well read in the Bible, the ancient classics, and Jerome. He stands between the credulous enthusiasm of his predecessors and the cold skepticism of later historians. In the first 15 books he depends on earlier reports and oral traditions; from the 16th to the 23rd book he speaks from his own observation and from reports of contemporaries. The last book is incomplete and consists only of a preface and one chapter. The criticism of Wilken, Ranke, Sybel and Hagenmeyer has shaken confidence in his originality, chronological accuracy, and his account of Peter the Hermit, but not in his general ability and trustworthiness as a historian. For a just estimate of William, see VON SYBEL, l. c. 108 sqq. (secd. ed.), and especially PRUTH, *Studien über Wilhelm v. Tyrus*, 1883, and his *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, p. 458-463; also WAGENMANN in Herzog,² Vol. XVII., 138-'42.

ANNA COMNENA (1083-1148, daughter of Alexis I., emperor of Constantinople); *Alexias* or *Alexiad*. A biography of her father, in Greek, in the *Corpus Script. Hist. Byzantinae*, Paris and Venice ed., Vol. XIII.; in the Bonn ed. by Reifferscheid, 1878. The portion which bears on Peter of Amiens and the First Crusade is also printed in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Grec*, Paris, 1873; and in Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremit* pp. 308-314. The Greek princess charges the Latin princes with

using the conquest of Jerusalem as a pretext for the conquest of the Greek empire.

RADULPHUS CADOMENHIS: *De Gestis Tancredi*, in **MURATORI**, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* (Mediol. 1723-51, 25 Tom. in 28 vols. fol.), Tom. V. 285-333; and **BERNARDUS THESAURARIUS:** *De Acquisitione Terræ Sanctæ*, *ibid.* Tom. VII. 664-848.

MATTHEW OF EDESSA: *Recit de la première croisade*, translated from the Armenian into French by **Edouard Delaurier**, Paris, 1850.

MICHAUD: *Bibliothèque des Croisades*. Paris, 1829. The fourth part is also published under the separate title: *Extraits des historiens Arabes relatifs aux guerres des croisades* par **R. REINAUD**.

Chronicles of the Crusades, London, 1848, comprises the contemporary narratives of the Crusades of Richard Cœur de Lion by **RICHARD OF DEVIZES** and **GODFREY DE VINCAUF**; and of the Crusade of Saint Louis by **LORD JOHN DE JOINVILLE**.

J. H. PETERMANN: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge aus Armenischen Quellen*, Berlin, 1860.

Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Paris, 1844-'66, 3 vols. fol.

H. PRUTZ: *Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Danzig, 1876.

Auxiliary information, geographical and historical, may be derived also from the reports of pilgrimages (peaceful crusades) to Palestine before, during, and after the Crusades. There are several collections: **COUNT REAUF:** *Expeditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des croisades*. Paris, 1865 and '67. **TITUS TOBLER** (d. 1871): *Pilgerreisen* (St. Gallen, 1865 sqq.); *Itinera et Descriptiones Terræ Sanctæ lingua latina æcæ. IV.-XI. exarata*, (Genev., 1877); *Bibliographia geographica Palestinae*, (Leipzig, 1867). **R. RÖHRICHT:** *Die Pilgerfahrten vor den Kreuzzügen*, 1875. **R. RÖHRICHT** and **H. MEISNER:** *Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach dem heil. Lande*. Berlin 1880 (from A. D. 1346-1588).

II. MODERN HISTORIES.

FRIEDRICH WILKEN (Libr. and Prof. in Berlin, d. 1840): *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Leipzig, 1807-'32, 7 vols. The most learned German work, still very valuable, especially in the later vols.

JOS. FR. MICHAUD (Member of the French Acad., d. 1839): *Histoire des Croisades*, Paris, 1812; 6th ed., 1840, 6 vols. *Bibliographie and Bibliothèque des Croisades*, in 4 Parts, Paris, 1829; added to the 5th and 6th editions of the *Histoire*. The best work in French. The History, without the bibliography and library, was poorly translated into English by **W. ROBSON**, Lond., 1854; reprinted N. York, 1880, in 3 vols.

G. Z. GRAY: *The Children's Crusade*. New York, 1870.

R. RÖHRICHT: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Berlin, 1874, '78, 2 vols.

BERNH. KUGLER (Prof. in Tübingen): *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Berlin, 1880 (with illustrations).

A. DE LAPORTE: *Les Croisades et le pays latin de Jérusalem*. Paris, 1881.

HANS PRUTZ (Prof. of History in Königsberg): *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*.

Berlin, 1883 (642 pages). Partly from MS. sources of the Vatican and the Order of St. John in Malta.

Popular Histories by CHARLES MILLS (*Hist. of the Crusades*. London, 1822; 4th ed. 1828, 2 vols.); JOH. SPORSCHIL (*Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Leipzig, 1843, illustrated); THOS. KNEIGHTLEY (*Hist. of the Crusades*, Lond., 1847); Major PROCTOR (*H. of the Crus.* illustrated, Lond. 1858; reprinted in Philad., 1854); W. E. DUTTON (*A Hist. of the Crus.*, London, 1877); JOHN G. EDGAR (*The Crusades and the Crusaders*, Lond., 1860); GEORGE W. COX (*The Crusades*, Lond. and N. York, 1878, 228 small pages).

III. The Crusades are described by GIBBON, *Decline and Fall*, Chs. LVIII-LXI.; HALLAM, *Middle Ages*, Ch. I., P. 1; MILMAN, *Latin Christianity*, Bk. VII. Ch. 6; GUIZOT, *History of Civilization* (Hazlitt's translation I. 149 sqq.); RAUMER, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen* (5th ed. Leipzig, 1873); GIMBRECHT, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* (4th ed. 1874 sqq.); RANKE, *Weltgeschichte*, Bd. VIII. (publ. 1887), pp. 86-111; 150-161; 223-262; 280-307. On the history of the Greeks in the age of the Crusades, see the works of FINLAY, *History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires from 1057 to 1463*, Edinb., 1854; HOFF, *Geschichte Griechenlands vom Beginn des Mittelalters*, etc., Leipzig, 1868; and HERTBERG, *Gesch. Griechenlands*, Gotha, 1877.

The Church Histories are meagre on this chapter.

IV. The poetry of the Crusades is represented chiefly by RAOUL DE CAEN, in *Gestes de Tancred*; TORQUATO TASSO, the Homer of the Crusades, in *La Gerusalemme liberata*, and by WALTER SCOTT in several novels, as "Tales of the Crusades;" "Ivanhoe;" "Quentin Durward;" "Count Robert of Paris," and "Castle Dangerous."

CHARACTER AND AIM OF THE CRUSADES.

The Crusades were armed pilgrimages to Jerusalem under the banner of the cross. They form one of the most salient and characteristic chapters of the Middle Ages, and have a romantic and sentimental, as well as a religious and military, interest. They exhibit the muscular Christianity of the new nations of the West which were just emerging from barbarism and heathenism. They made religion subservient to war, and war subservient to religion. They constitute the heroic age of the church; but it was the aggressive, warlike heroism of brute force, not the passive heroism of martyrdom, nor the moral heroism which secures victory by persuasion and conviction. We may compare it to the heroism of the Judges and the Macabees in the history of Israel, and to the heroism of the Greeks

in the Trojan war. But the Crusades were on a much larger scale, and of longer duration. They were a succession of tournaments between two Continents and two religions, struggling for supremacy. Such a spectacle the world has never seen before or since, and will never see again.

The aim of the Crusades was the conquest of the Holy Land, the victory over Islam, the rule of Christian Europe in Asia. The cross was the badge and banner of the Crusades—hence the name. Enthusiasm for Christ was the moving power, but largely mixed with lower motives of ambition, avarice, love of adventure, hope of earthly and heavenly reward. The whole chivalry of Europe, aroused by a pale-faced monk and encouraged by a Hildebrandian pope, threw itself steel-clad upon the Orient to execute the vengeance of heaven upon the cruelties of Moslems against Christian pilgrims, and to rescue the grave of the Redeemer of mankind from the polluting grasp of the False Prophet of Mecca.

The Crusaders sought the living among the dead. They mistook the visible for the invisible, the terrestrial for the celestial, Jerusalem, and returned disappointed. They learned in Jerusalem that Christ was not there, that He is risen, and ascended to heaven as the head of a spiritual and eternal kingdom. They conquered and lost, they reconquered and lost again, the city in which Christ was crucified. It is impossible to convert false religions by violence; it can only be done by the slow but sure process of persuasion and conviction. Hatred kindles hatred, and those who take the sword will perish by the sword. St. Bernard learned from the failure of the second crusade, that it is better to struggle against the sinful lusts of the heart than to conquer Jerusalem. But the temporal loss was a spiritual gain and a blessing in disguise for future generations.

The Crusades were migrations of nations from the West to the East under the influence of religion—a counter-movement of the migrations from the East to the West under the impulse of plunder and conquest. They were upheavals of society from the depths of human nature, and reveal with striking plasticity the

general state of thought and feeling. The Middle Ages present unmitigated contrasts: the pope with the triple crown deposing kings and emperors, and the monk imitating the voluntary poverty of Christ; the robber-lord in his castle indulging his passions without restraint, and, close by, the hermit in the forest renouncing all gratifications of his natural desires; or the saintly nun striving to realize the ideal of an angel on earth, and, not far off, the witch who had sold her soul to Satan, and boasted of the bargain. We see the bishop riding in princely attire, and the begging monk and coarse peasant walking beside him. The mighty cathedrals, with spires rising to the clouds, are surrounded by miserable hovels. A fierce and adventurous spirit of war, inherited from barbaric ancestors, the invaders of Europe, was associated with a crushing and helpless feeling of repentance which found expression in the penitential trains of the Flagellants, and filled the convents to overflowing. And these contrasts, characteristic of life in general, reached far into individual life, which often suffered shipwreck in a horrible struggle between the unbaptized passions of the heart, and the new light which had dawned upon the conscience. We see many a wild career of hatred, revenge, rapacity and sensuality, ending in a bottomless abyss of remorse and despair.

Between these contrasts the crusades acted as a mediator, as a *novum salutis genus*. The passions remained, but they entered into the service of religion. A spring of reconciliation was discovered, and thousands precipitated themselves to drink of its water. "God," says the abbot Guibert, "invented the Crusades as a new way for the laity to atone for their sins, and to merit salvation."

The Crusades began and ended in France. The French element was the ruling factor, from Urban II. (who was a native of Chatillon near Rheims) and Peter of Amiens to Saint Louis. The French are a mercurial, impulsive and generous nation, and enthusiastic for enterprises which promise glory and reward. Besides them, Italians, chiefly the Normans in Southern Italy, Germans, chiefly from Lorraine, and Englishmen took

a prominent part. Spain had a crusade of her own against the Moors, who were finally expelled from Granada under Ferdinand and Isabella the Catholic, and then she entered upon a new kind of crusade against Jews and heretics at home, and heathen Indians in Cuba, Mexico, and Peru.

Emperors and kings led the expeditions; the popes stayed at home, but were represented in the army by legates, and acted as the power behind the throne.

PILGRIMAGES TO THE HOLY LAND.

The legends of the disinterment of the true cross, and the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre in the beginning of the fourth century, directed the devotional feelings of Christendom to the Holy Land. Constantine's mother, Helena, built a magnificent church over the Holy Sepulchre, and pilgrims began to direct their steps to Jerusalem. Several of the Fathers, such as Gregory of Nyssa, Augustin, and even Jerome, discouraged this movement and emphasized, with perfect truth, that man is no nearer to God in Jerusalem than in any other place, and that a holy life may be led in any part of the world. But these warnings had no effect. Every religion has its shrines; a desire to worship at these shrines is inherent in human nature, and the devotion, kindled by the actual presence of such divine remembrances, may be genuine and helpful. St. Jerome himself, with some pious ladies of Rome, spent his last years and performed his last works close by the Cave of the Nativity at Bethlehem. There he translated and explained the Scriptures, chanted the Psalter, taught monks and nuns, corresponded with distant friends, entertained the ever-increasing swarms of pilgrims, and prepared for eternity. The effect of his example was equal to his great reputation.

Once started, the movement steadily grew in extent and intensity. The Holy Land became to the imagination a land of wonders, filled with the divine presence of Christ. To have visited that land, to have seen Jerusalem, to have bathed in the Jordan, cast a halo of glory about a man. And as the pil-

grimage was connected with considerable difficulties and dangers, it became to the troubled conscience of a burdened soul a means of expiation.

So great was the multitude of pilgrims which annually visited Palestine, that special laws were enacted in their behalf, and public establishments founded for the comfort. Charlemagne ordered that they should every where in his realm be provided with lodging, fire, and water. Gregory the Great built a huge caravansary for their reception in Jerusalem. Hospitals and other beneficent institutions were erected by private piety all along the main route.

Special circumstances now and then added new impulses to the movement, such as the wide-spread belief that the world should come to an end in the year 1000; the high price which relics from Palestine brought in western Europe; the exemptions from toll which the pilgrims enjoyed, and which enabled them to start a very profitable commerce in silk, paper, spices, and other products of the East.

In this lively intercourse between Palestine and the Latin world, the conquest of Jerusalem in 637 by Caliph Omar made no serious interruptions. The Saracens were a more civilized people than either the Franks or the Goths; they considered Jerusalem one of their own holy cities, and treated it accordingly; pilgrimages were with them a sacred custom, and, by paying a small tribute, the Christian pilgrims were allowed to come and go without hindrance. Haroun al-Rashid, the most famous caliph of the Abbassides, even sent the keys of the Holy Sepulchre to Charlemagne, his great contemporary in the west, and thus secured the safety of the Christian pilgrims.

In 980 Syria and Palestine passed from the possession of the Caliph of Bagdad into that of the Sultan of Egypt, and Hakim, the third ruler of the Fatimide dynasty and a fanatical Mohammedan, began, in 1010, a fierce persecution of the Christian residents of Palestine and the Christian pilgrims. The trouble, however, was short and transient.

CAUSES OF THE CRUSADES.

In 1076 the Holy Land was conquered by the Seljukian Turks, a rough and savage race, who converted to Islamism, and like all young converts, fanatical beyond measure. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre was destroyed; the Christian inhabitants of the country were massacred or sold as slaves; of the stream of pilgrims which steadily poured into Palestine from western Europe, only a few stragglers returned, and these were not, as formerly, pilgrims, but covered with wounds, broken in spirit and body from the cruelties to which they had been exposed.

These barbarous cruelties of the Turks were the immediate cause of the Crusades. The suffering of pilgrims excited everywhere sympathy and pity. The fact that Turks should possess the Holy Land, while Christians were excluded, roused the indignation of Europe. In touching the springs of action these feelings stirred up the passions of the age, and produced a tremendous explosion. War was still the profession, the business, the glory of every free man in western Europe; he knew no other occupation. The wild roving of whole nations from one end of the continent to the other had ceased, and everywhere the state was engaged in consolidating, and developing social organization; but as yet things were not settled, and pictures of daring adventures and warlike exploits were still floating before the imagination. The organized campaigns for robbery and piracy had ceased, and everywhere the Church was active in substituting the law for the feud; but as yet the principle of honor which ruled man's conscience was that of self-revenge. The Church had labored hard, and not without success, to transform the pagan viking into a Christian knight. From the beginning of the tenth century the investment with knighthood was accompanied with religious rites. The knight had begun to feel himself as the warrior of Christ, and thus the Crusade represented itself to the eyes of the Middle Ages, not only as the greatest duty, but also as the highest ideal.

Other elements active in creating and propagating this grand movement of the Crusades, will become apparent from the narrative of the events.

NUMBER OF CRUSADES.

There are at least seven (some number nine) Crusades, besides the Children's Crusade, and one or two which failed in the start. They are marked by the years 1096, (1101), 1147, 1189, (1197), 1204, 1228, 1248, 1270. The most important and successful was the first (1096-'99), which ended with the conquest of Jerusalem. The second (1147-'49) was inspired by St. Bernard, but proved a disastrous failure. The third (1189) was occasioned by the fall of Jerusalem (1187), and rendered famous by Frederick Barbarossa, Richard Cœur de Lion, and Saladin. The fourth (1204) was a conquest of Constantinople and the establishment of a Latin empire, which lasted nearly half a century (1261), and intensified the bitter feeling of the Greeks against Rome. The fifth embraces the expeditions from 1212-'30, in which the Popes Innocent III., Gregory IX., and Emperor Frederick II. are the leading figures. The sixth and seventh (or eighth and ninth) crusades of 1248 and 1270 were complete failures. They derive their chief interest from Saint Louis IX., of France, who revived the spirit of Godfrey of Bouillon, but met with disaster and died of the plague at Tunis in sight of the ruins of Carthage (Aug. 25, 1270), with unclouded trust in God, as expressed in his last utterance: "I will enter thy house, O Lord; I will worship in thy sanctuary." He was the truest and the purest of the crusaders, a wise, just, magnanimous and conscientious ruler, and a saint of the mediæval type, devout, superstitious, charitable and intolerant, adoring the cross on his knees and looking with composure at the torture of heretics. He defended the rights of the laity and defended the liberties of the Gallican Church, and, by the famous Pragmatic Sanction (1259), he forbade the Roman curia to levy money on France without royal consent. Nevertheless he was canonized by Boniface VIII. (in

1297).¹ With him died the enthusiasm for the Crusades. Several attempts of the popes to revive it proved abortive.

Jerusalem was conquered, 1099, lost, 1187, reconquered, 1229, finally lost, 1244, and still groans, with all the lands of the Bible, under the degrading bondage of the Turks.

PETER THE HERMIT.

On Peter the Hermit and the entire history of the First Crusade, see, besides the general works quoted above, the following modern treatises:

HEINRICH VON SYBEL: *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs*, Dümoldorf, 1841 (551 pp.); second ed. 1881 (slightly improved, 468 pp.). This work which originated in the historical exercises of Ranke, 1837, marks an epoch by its critical method of research and a careful examination of all the sources. Comp. *The History and Literature of the Crusades. From the German of von Sybel*, ed. by Lady DUFF GORDON, London, 1861. The first part is a translation of Sybel's four lectures on the Crusades delivered in March, 1855; the second part is a translation of the literary introduction to Sybel's History of the First Crusade (first ed.).

J. F. A. PEYRÉ: *Histoire de la première Croisade*. Paris, 1850.

H. HAGENMEYER: *Peter der Eremit*, Leipzig, 1879 (401 pp.). This is the first critical biography of Peter, including the contemporary records (pp. 301 sqq.). The older biographies, by P. P. d' OULTRÉMAN (1645), VION (Amiens, 1858), and LÉON PAULET (Paris, 1856), are largely legendary.

Peter the Hermit is the reputed originator of the first Crusade. His life has been embellished by Albertus Aquensis, William of Tyre, and later monastic historians, with romantic legends which cannot stand the test of examination. Modern criticism has sifted the facts from fiction, and reduced him to a secondary position in that movement. He was not the author of the Crusades. That honor belongs to the Pope. But he was the chief among the many pilgrims of his age who brought home the tales of their sufferings in the East, and fired the popular heart for the first crusade. His speeches in behalf of the Crusades were listened to as divine messages. He was more highly esteemed than any person of his age.²

¹ Joinville, *Histoire de St. Louis*, ed. by Natalie de Wailly (Paris, 1878); Tillemont, *Histoire de St. Louis*; Guizot, *Histoire de quatre grands Chrétiens français* (Paris, 1873).

² "Neminem meminerim similem honore haberi," says Guibert, who attended the Council of Clermont, and saw and heard him. Bongars, 32, 56. Hagenmeyer, 120 sq.

Peter was born, according to the popular story, at Amiens, in the province of Picardy, first served in the army of Eustace of Bouillon, his feudal lord, but then gave up all worldly aspirations, and retired to a monastery. Hence he retreated into a neighboring wilderness where he lived as an anchorite. Finally he entered upon a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, some years before the First Crusade.¹ Here he not only witnessed, but experienced himself, the indignities and cruelties to which the Christians were exposed under the sway of the Seljukian Turks. The patriarch, Simeon of Jerusalem, and Christ himself, who appeared to him in a dream, urged him to rouse all Europe to a war for the conquest of the Holy Sepulchre.

According to Albert's account, Christ appeared to Peter in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre after he had fallen asleep, and said to him: "Peter, dearest son, arise, go to the patriarch and take from him the letter of my commission. Tell your countrymen of the miseries of the holy places and rouse their hearts, that they purify Jerusalem, and deliver the saints from the hands of the heathen. For the gates of paradise are open to those whom I have chosen and called." According to William of Tyre,² Peter had first an interview with the patriarch, and asked from him letters to the Pope, and the kings of the West. Then Christ appeared to him in a dream, after a night spent in prayer, and told him: "Peter, arise and hasten to fulfil thy mission without fear; for I shall be with thee. It is high time that the sanctuary be purged, and my servants be helped (*ut purgentur sancta, et servis meis subveniatur*)." Visions and dreams figure largely in the first crusade, especially the vision of the holy lance, which was discovered during the siege of Antioch in June, 1098, and decided the victory over Kerboga. This instrument, which pierced the side of the Saviour, was buried beneath the altar of St. Peter's Church at Antioch, and

¹ The contemporary historians give no date; later reports vary between 1090 and 1095. See Hagenmeyer, p. 88, note.

² Bk. I., ch. 11 and 12.

was revealed by St. Andrew to an humble person, Peter Bartholomew of Provence.

But the silence of Anna Comnena, and other contemporary reports, make it, at least, doubtful whether Peter reached Jerusalem on his first journey to the East. If he did not, the vision of Christ and the interview with the patriarch must be regarded as legends of a later age.¹

On his return to Europe, Peter presented himself before Pope Urban II., who was deeply impressed with the fiery enthusiasm of the hermit, and promised him support in his enterprise.

Thus provided with divine confirmation of his mission, Peter set out on a tour through France and Italy to preach the first crusade. Small and haggard, and with visible traces of the severest ascetic exercises; bare-footed and bare-headed, mounted on an ass and holding aloft a huge cross with his hands, he presented the appearance just fit to strike the popular imagination. Immense crowds gathered around him whenever he stopped to preach, on the roadside, or in the market-place, or from the steps of the church-door. Still more impressive was his eloquence, spasmodic and uncouth, but flaming with living fire, and lighting everything it struck. When he described the sufferings inflicted on the children of God by God's enemies, and explained the duty of taking up the cause of God against the power of Satan, the crowds bowed down before him, half in horror and half in rapture, and the frenzy of his own soul spread like an epidemic from town to town, from country to country.²

¹ So von Sybel, pp. 195 sqq., and especially Hagenmeyer, pp. 53-55, and 314-330. But the argument from silence is not conclusive. Anna Comnena, besides misconstruing the motives of the crusaders, makes several mistakes, and confounds Peter the Hermit once with Adhemar of Puy and once with Petrus Bartholomæus. See Hagenmeyer, p. 313, notes. She also makes the most exaggerated statement that Peter, on his second journey, arrived at Constantinople with an army of 80,000 horsemen and 100,000 footmen.

² William of Tyre (I. 11) thus describes the hermit: "*Puillus, persona contemptibilis, vivacis ingenii, et oculum habens perspicacem gratumque, et sponte fluens ei non deerat eloquium.*" See other descriptions of contemporary writers in Hagenmeyer, pp. 114 sqq.

That Peter, on his return from the Orient, roused Europe by his speeches is confirmed by all contemporary reports, including that of Anna Comnena; but his acquaintance with the Pope probably dated from the Synod of Clermont, and he made his preaching tour through France, Lorraine and along the Rhine after that Synod in the winter from 1095 to 1096.¹

URBAN II. AND THE SYNOD OF CLERMONT.

VON SYBEL, pp. 183 sqq. HEFELE, V. 215-240.

The idea of an organized expedition of Christian Europe for the reconquest of the Holy Land, where our Lord and Saviour accomplished our redemption, originated with the revival of the Papacy, and grew with its power. Sylvester II. (999-1002) first suggested it at the close of the first millennium, but prematurely.

Gregory VII. resumed the project more seriously, and was ready to head an army of fifty thousand crusaders for the protection of the Greek empire, with the ulterior object of making it subject to the dominion of St. Peter. The last was the main point with him. He issued a call to Christendom for this purpose, March 1, and again December 16, 1074; but his quarrel with Henry IV. prevented the execution.²

This was left to his second successor, Urban II. He was urgently requested by the Greek emperor, Alexius Comnenus, to come to his aid against the invading Turks. The forward movement which Islam made in Asia Minor, in North Africa, in Sicily, and in Spain, threatened Christendom with a dangerous crisis. Urban took up the idea of Hildebrand with the same hope of uniting the Orient and the Occident under the dominion of the Holy See.

¹ Sybel, 198 sqq.; Hagenmeyer, 86 sqq. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, V. 233 (2d ed. 1886), agrees substantially with them. Hagenmeyer admits as very probable that Peter attended the Council of Clermont, but regards his rousing speech there as a fiction (pp. 103 sq.).

² He repeatedly refers to such a project in letters to Henry IV., Count William of Burgundy, Count William of Poitiers, and in two encyclicals, all from the year 1074. See Hefele, V. 33 sq., and Sybel, pp. 168 sq.

In the month of March, 1095, Urban called a council at Piacenza, mostly consisting of Italian prelates. The ambassadors of Alexius Comnenus were present, and addressed the assembly, though with no great effect. The council was only a preparation for that which followed in November of the same year at Clermont (Claramonte), the capital of Auvergne in France. The year 1095 was a year of famine and pestilence, and called men to serious reflections.

The Synodus Claramontana lasted eight days, and comprised an immense number of ecclesiastics and laymen of all ranks from Italy, France and Germany. On the day of the opening there were counted fourteen archbishops, two hundred and fifty bishops, and four hundred abbots. Thousands of tents were pitched outside of the walls.¹

This synod is the mother of the Crusades. On the ninth day of the session, the Pope addressed the multitude from an elevated platform raised in the open air. It was the happiest moment, the world-historical occasion for Urban. His speech was the most effective sermon ever preached by a pope, or any other man; it roused the deepest enthusiasm; it resounded throughout all Europe, and its effects were felt for centuries to come. He probably spoke in the Provencal tongue which was his vernacular, but we have only Latin reports.² When we remember the general character of the crowd which stood listening around the platform, we cannot wonder at the response. There was not an idea in the brain of his hearers, not a passion in their hearts, to which Urban II. did not appeal. He quoted passages from the Psalms and the Prophets about the glory of Jerusalem, and the duty to remember her. He predicted that God Himself would lead his soldiers across mountains and rivers, feed them with bread and manna, and crown them with

¹ We have no complete acts of the Synod, but several documents and scattered reports of chroniclers. See the collections of Mansi, Harduin, and Labbe; also Hefle V. 220 sqq.; Pflugk-Harttung, *Acta Pontif. inedita* II, 161; and Jaffé-Wattenbach, *Regesta Pontif. Rom.*, p. 681.

² In three forms, by William of Tyre, William of Malmesbury, and in a Vatican MS.

victory; yea, he added, "the wealth of your enemies shall be yours; you shall plunder their treasures." He offered plenary indulgence to all who with pure motives embarked in the undertaking, and promised that any one who fell in the field, and died in true repentance, should reap eternal reward in heaven.¹

The answer was the unanimous cry: "God wills it, God wills it!"²

"It is," added the Pope, "it is indeed the will of God. Let these words be your war-cry when you unsheath your sword against the enemy. You are soldiers of the cross: wear, then, on your breasts, or on your shoulders, the blood-red sign of Him who died for the salvation of your souls. Wear it as a token that His help will never fail you: wear it as the pledge of a vow which can never be recalled."

These words were the sound of the trumpet of war against the Turks for the glory of Christ. Thousands at once made the vow, and sewed the red cross on their garments.³ Many more thousands throughout Europe followed the example, as soon as the report of the speech of the Pope, or of the hermit reached their ears. In a few months, whole armies were ready to march against the enemies of the cross.

The motives were very different. Pure and noble enthusiasm for Christ was the strongest and deepest motive. But multitudes were influenced in whole, or in part, by vulgar superstition, or love of adventure, glory, and gain. Plenary indulgence was

¹ According to William of Tyre, who gives a lively sketch of Urban's speech, lib. I. c. 14, Urban said: "*Nos autem de misericordia Domini, et beat. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum auctoritate confisi, fidelibus Christianis, qui contra eos arma suscepunt, et onus sibi huius peregrinationis assumerint, injunctas sibi pro suis delictis penitentias relaxamus. Qui autem ibi in vera penitentia decesserint, et peccatorum indulgentiam et fructum aeternae mercedis se non dubitent habituros.*" The Synod confirmed this promise, *Can. Claromontanus II.* (in Mansi XX. 816): "*Quicumque pro sola devotione, non pro honoris vel pecunie adoptione, ad liberandam Ecclesiam Dei Jerusalem profectus fuerit, iter illud pro omni penitentia [et] reputetur.*"

² *Deus vult; Deos lo vult; Dixit et vult.*

³ In the first crusade all the crosses were red; afterwards green and white colors came also into use.

offered to every penitent crusader; the debtor escaped his creditor, the convict the arm of justice, the serf the oppression of his feudal lord. An intoxicated feeling of freedom, yea, a wild craving for license was let loose. The feudal chieftain looked for the excitement of war, which was his favorite, perhaps his only, occupation, or for vast and permanent conquests, like those which Robert Guiscard and his Normans had won in Apulia and Sicily. The merchants and usurers favored the movement; for their losses in ordinary trade were more than made up by the gains from the sale of arms and horses at exorbitant prices, and from the purchase of mortgaged lands far below their value. Kings strengthened their power, in the absence of the nobles, by the absorption of the smaller into larger fiefs, and of these again into the royal domain. The chief promoter and gainer was the Pope himself, who superintended the crusaders by his legates, exercised the tremendous power of absolution, and acquired the protectorate of the temporal dominions of the crusading princes for the benefit of the Church.

THE FIRST CRUSADE AND THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM.

PETER THE HERMIT.

*Canto l'armi pietose e'l capitano,
Che 'l gran sepolcro liberò di Cristo.
Molto egli oprò col senno e con la mano,
Molto soffrì nel glorioso acquisto
E invan l'inferno a lui s'oppose, e invano
S'armò d'Asia e di Libia il popol misto;
Chè il ciel gli died' favore, e sotto ai santi
Segni ridusse i suoi compagni erranti.*

—TORQUATO TASSO (Canto I. 1).

The fifteenth of August, 1096 (the Feast of the Assumption), had been fixed by the Council of Clermont for the departure of the crusaders; but the excitement was too strong; people could not wait. Early in the spring immense crowds of both sexes and all ages gathered together in Lorraine, and demanded of Peter, the Hermit, that he should immediately lead them to

Jerusalem. The crowd comprised a mixed multitude of enthusiasts, fanatics, knaves, idlers, and silly people, without discipline, organisation, or preparation of any kind. The peasant placed his wife and children on a cart drawn by oxen, and thus went out to fight the Turk. When the crowd had swelled to some sixty thousand, it was necessary to divide it.

The first division comprising about twenty thousand under the lead of a Burgundian knight, Walter the Penniless,¹ marched safely through Hungary, but was completely cut up and destroyed in the Bulgarian forests; only the leader, and a few stragglers, reached Constantinople.

The second division, comprising more than forty thousand, under the lead of the Hermit himself, marched through Hungary, provided with all necessities by the Hungarian king, and guarded by the Hungarian army. But when they reached the Bulgarian frontier they found one continuous streak of blood and fire, robbery and massacre, marking out the route of their predecessors. A spirit of excess and revenge seized the undisciplined host. They attacked Zemlin, and again Nissa, but in both places they were repulsed with fearful slaughter, and only a remnant of seven thousand finally reached Constantinople in a most pitiful condition (July, 1096). Here they were well treated by the emperor Alexius, and transferred by his aid across the Bosphorus to Asia, where they should wait for the arrival of the regular army; but they preferred to spread, marauding and plundering, through the rich provinces. Finally, a false rumor that the vanguard had captured Nicæa, the capital of the Turks in Asia Minor, allured them down into the plain of Nicæa; but they were surrounded and massacred by the Turkish cavalry, and their bones were piled into a ghastly pyramid—the first monument of the crusaders. Walter had fallen in the battle, but Peter the Hermit had fled back to Constantinople before the battle began.

A third swarm, mostly consisting of Germans, and comprising about fifteen thousand, under the lead of a German monk,

¹ *W. Sinchabere, Sansachor, Sansavoir, Habenichts.*

Gottschalk, was closely watched, and at last massacred by the Hungarians at Belgrade.

A fourth swarm, comprising more than two hundred thousand men, women and children, from various countries, was led by banners with the likeness of a goose and a goat) which were considered as bearers of the divine Spirit. Three thousand horsemen, headed by some noblemen, attended them, and shared their spoils. They began their expedition by robbing and murdering the Jews in all the rich commercial places along the Rhine and the Danube, holding them personally responsible for the crucifixion.¹ When they arrived at the Hungarian frontier they had to encounter a regular army. A panic seized them, and a frightful carnage took place.

These preliminary expeditions of the first Crusade cost about three hundred thousand lives.

The regular army of the Crusaders consisted, according to the lowest calculations, of more than 800,000, and was divided into six divisions under several leaders. Adhemar (Aymer), bishop of Puy, the papal legate, was the first among the clergy to assume the cross, and had a sort of spiritual supervision of the whole army.² The military leaders were Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, and his brothers, Baldwin and Eustace; Hugh, count of Vermandois, a brother of King Philip I., of France; Robert, duke of Normandy, the eldest son of William the Conqueror; Raymond, count of Toulouse, a veteran warrior, who had a hundred thousand horse and foot at his command, and enjoyed a mingled reputation for wealth, wisdom, pride, and greed; Bohemond, Prince of Tarentum and son of Robert Guiscard; his cousin Tancred, the model

¹ Mannheimer, *Die Judenverfolgungen in Speier, Worms und Mainz im Jahre 1096, während des ersten Kreuzzuges*, Darmstadt, 1877. Hagenmeyer, p. 139, clears Peter of Amiens of the shameful glory of initiating this *Judenhetze*, and claims it for Count Esnich of Leiningen, and his mob, who began it at Mainz, May 27, 1096.

² Gibbon calls him "a respectable prelate alike qualified for this world and the next."

cavalier; Robert, Count of Flanders, surnamed "the Sword and Lance of the Christians"; Stephen, Count of Chartres, Troyes, and Blois, the owner of 365 castles. These, and many others, constituted the strength and beauty of the French and Italian nobility.

The moral hero of the First Crusade is Godfrey of Bouillon.¹ He was a descendant of Charlemagne, in the female line, and deserved the first rank in war and council, but had no definite command, and was merely *primus inter pares*. He had fought in the war of Emperor Henry IV. against the rebel King Rudolph of Swabia, whom he slew in the battle of Mölsen (1080); he was the first to mount the walls of Rome, and forced Hildebrand to flee; but, by assuming the crusading vow, he placed himself on the side of Urban II. He mediated between the Germans and French, and spoke the languages of both. He had prodigious physical strength; with one blow of his sword he clove asunder a horseman from head to saddle. He was as humble and pious as brave, and took the cross for the single purpose of rescuing Jerusalem from the hands of infidels. He waived his prowess, and bent his pride to the general aim. In secular matters he was inferior to Bohemond and Raymond. Contemporary historians call him a holy monk in military armor and ducal ornament. His purity and disinterestedness was acknowledged by his rivals.

Tancred, his intimate friend, likewise engaged from pure motives in the enterprise. He is the poetic hero of the first Crusade, and nearly approached the standard of "the gentle and perfect Knight" of Chaucer. He distinguished himself at Nicea, Dorylæum, Antioch, and was one of the first to climb the walls of Jerusalem. In the carnage which followed, he, almost alone among the Christian knights, showed the spirit of mercy, and saved thousands of the captured, at the risk of his

¹ Bouillon (not to be confounded with Boulogne-sur-Mère, on the English Channel) is a town in Belgian Luxemburg, and was formerly the capital of the lordship of Bouillon which Godfrey mortgaged to the bishop of Liège in 1095. It belongs to Belgium since 1831.

own life. He died in Antioch, 1112. His deeds were celebrated by Raoul de Caen and Torquato Tasso.¹

The several divisions marched at different times, and along various routes, to meet at Constantinople. The Emperor Alexius, who had so urgently solicited the aid of Western Europe, became alarmed when he saw the hosts arrive. He wished to reap the benefit, without sharing the risks, of the Crusade. He began to tremble for himself, and took good care to transfer each division to Asia before the next one arrived. The selfish jealousy and greed of the leaders became, day by day, more manifest, and retarded and diminished the success of the enterprise. The hardships and privations were terrible; nevertheless, the army pressed slowly forward.

Nicæa was taken June 19, 1097, and the Turks were routed at Doryleum in Phrygia, July 4. But it took a whole year before Antioch in Syria was captured, June 28, 1098, and still another year before Jerusalem was conquered, July 15, 1099. During the siege of Antioch, the ranks of the crusaders were decimated by famine, pestilence, and desertion, and immediately after the capture of the city they were besieged themselves by an army of about 200,000 Mohammedans under Kerboga.

After the fall of Nicæa, Baldwin, a brother of Godfrey, went with one detachment to Edessa, where he established himself, and began to operate on his own account. After the fall of Antioch, Bohemond did the same in that place. Others followed the example, and out of the immense army which arrived in Asia, only 20,000 reached Jerusalem.²

When they came in sight of the holy city, the fierce warriors fell on their knees, kissed the earth, laid aside their armor, and advanced as pilgrims, with sighs and tears and penitential hymns.

The siege lasted five weeks, and was marked by all the hor-

¹ Gibbon: "In the accomplished character of Tancred we discover all the virtues of a perfect knight, the true spirit of chivalry, which inspired the generous sentiments and social offices of man far better than the base philosophy, or the baser religion, of the times."

² The figures differ. See Sybel, p. 412.

rors of savage warfare. After the capture, the Mohammedan population was massacred to the extent of more than seventy thousand; the Jews were burnt in their synagogues. When the crusaders went bare-footed to the place of the Holy Sepulchre to offer up their prayers and thanks, they were wading in blood.¹

The Christians entered Jerusalem on a Friday at three in the afternoon, the day and hour of the crucifixion. This should have inspired them with sentiments of mercy, but it only enflamed their fanatical hatred of the enemies of the cross.

After the acts of devotion at the reputed tomb of the Saviour, another deliberate massacre followed, and men, women, and children, who had retreated to the Mosque of Omar, were mowed down in the delirium of fanaticism and vengeance. Neither the tears of women, nor the cries of infants, nor the protests of Tancred, who was concerned for the honor of chivalry, could soften or restrain the ferocity of the conquerors. The Saracen prisoners were forced to clean the city, and to save it from pestilential diseases. "They wept," says Robert the Monk, "and transported the carcasses out of Jerusalem."

The contemporary historians recite these scenes of barbaric cruelty without excuse, and without an expression of horror or pity. They saw in it only the righteous judgment of God over his enemies. Such was the piety of the Crusaders!

The spirit of the Middle Ages combined, among other striking contrasts, self-denying charity to Catholic Christians with heartless cruelty to infidels, Jews, and heretics. It was the spirit of the Old Testament rather than that of the New. It followed the rule: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy," and forgot the law of Christ: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you."

A week later Godfrey of Bouillon was chosen King of Jerusalem. He accepted the office, but refused the title; he was

¹ Raymond d'Agiles reports, with incredible exaggeration, that in the temple and portico of Solomon the blood reached to the knees of the riders and the bridles of the horses (*usque ad genua et usque ad frenos equorum*).

unwilling to "wear a crown of gold where his Saviour had worn a crown of thorns." He called himself simply the Defender of the Holy Sepulchre. He founded a monastery in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, died in Jerusalem July 18, 1100, and was buried on Calvary. He was succeeded by his brave brother Baldwin I., who accepted the title of King of Jerusalem.

Most of the other leaders returned home, weary and disappointed.

Among those who returned, was also Peter the Hermit. The closing incident of his connection with the Crusades is an address he delivered to the victorious army on Mount Olivet, and the homage offered to him. He founded a monastery at Huy in the diocese of Liège, in honor of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and died July 8, 1115. A statue of Peter was erected on the Place Saint Michael at Amiens, June 29, 1854. It represents him as a monk, preaching the crusade, with a rosary suspended on his girdle, holding a cross in his right hand, the left on his breast.¹

¹ There are several pictures of Peter, of which Hagenmeyer gives an account, pp. 116 and 300. Some of his admirers pulled the hairs out of his donkey and kept them as relics.

II.

FAITH AND WORKS.

BY PROFESSOR EML. V. GERHART, D.D.

I.—CHRISTIAN FREEDOM.

BORN of the Spirit into the kingdom, and at peace with God by faith, the members of Christ live in the sphere of freedom. Their freedom is twofold.

On the one hand they are emancipated from the dominion of sin. "Our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin."* On the other hand, the members of Christ become active in the Truth and for the Truth. The Truth is both the principle and the end of their life. "We were buried with Him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life."† "Present yourselves unto God as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God."‡

Such a life bears fruit in good works. Works are the words spoken and the things done by man, a moral agent. The moral quality of works is derived from the moral quality of personality. It is the man that forms the character.

Both in the Old and the New Testament a person is compared to a tree. Says our Lord: Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit."§

* Rom. 6: 6.

† Rom. 6: 4.

‡ Rom. 6: 13.

§ Matt. 7: 17, 18; cf. Ps. 1: 3; Gen. 17: 8.

A living member of the "true Vine" will in speech and in conduct bear the fruits of the Vine.

The spiritual status of the man conditions the genius of his words and deeds. If the man be "rooted and grounded" in the love of Christ, his works may be good; good, inasmuch as Christian love energizes and animates them. In turn, works inspired and sustained by Christian love exert a reactionary influence on the character of the man. Love, active according to its own law, becomes more mature and more fruitful. The person becomes better for the good works which he does.

The reverse order involves a false conception of works. Works that are good react upon the man who is good. But in the first instance the works do not condition the character of the man. It cannot be said that the works must be good in order that the man may become good. The fruit does not condition the tree; but the tree the fruit. Fruit reveals and expresses the species and the life of the tree.

In answer to the question: Whether it be necessary that the believer, a person justified by faith alone, do good works? the unqualified answer must be given in the affirmative. Good works are necessary, not that he may make amends for his sins and obtain forgiveness, but because amends have been made by the Mediator, and he has received forgiveness; not that he may gain the approval of God, but because he has God's approval; not, in other words, that he may become righteous before God, but because, being a member of Christ by faith, he is righteous. Righteous in Christ, righteous by faith working through love, possessing the peace that passeth all understanding, he must, of inward necessity, live a righteous life. It will be his meat and drink to do the will of his Father which is in heaven.

A scriptural conception respecting the good works of a Christian presupposes the truth of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, without the works of the law. Believers are approved of God to the end that they may live an approved life. They are justified of free grace without any merits of

their own to the end that "the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in them." * Without self-inspired works they are righteous in Christ that they may do God-inspired works. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. †

What are good works? An answer at once scriptural, comprehensive and concise is given by the Heidelberg Catechism, which says: Good works are "those which are done from true faith, according to the Law of God, for His glory; and not such as rest on our own opinion or the commandments of men." ‡ This proposition embraces three things: 1. The source or principle of good works; 2. The criterion or standard of moral judgment; 3. The ultimate end. Works are in the evangelical sense good that unite these three elements. Such works proceed from faith in Christ; the law of God has for them regulative force, and the manifestation of God is the end for which works are done.

II.—WORKS DONE FROM TRUE FAITH.

Good works have a principle, a living fountain in personality from which they flow. This principle is not human will, but true faith in Jesus Christ by whom human will is inspired and governed.

Words spoken and deeds done that are morally good presuppose the free action of the human will; but not the action of will divorced from its fundamental law.

Freedom is the product of two factors: Of the divine Law, and of volition; the one being objective, the other subjective. Moral law, the expression of the authority of God's righteous love, is the truth for human personality. Truth is the fundamental warrant and condition of freedom. The noblest truth conditions the noblest freedom. The Truth from which all truths derive their truthfulness and their worth is the Son of God incarnate. This rank He claims for Himself: 'I am the

* Rom. 8: 4.

† Rom. 8: 5.

‡ H. C'm. 91.

Truth.' Therefore respecting freedom He says: If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.*

The Son does not make a man free mechanically, or magically. Free a man becomes when he chooses the Son, when by the act of his own will he accepts as the fundamental law of his life the Truth which the incarnate Son is. Appropriating the Truth to himself by his voluntary act, he and the objective Truth become ethically one. By the right action of will the Truth possesses and is possessed by personality. Then the Truth lives in the man, and is the controlling principle of moral action. Only from this principle proceed works that in the Christian sense are really good.

All moral action, whether good or bad, is voluntary. Wrong-doing, no less than right doing, pre-supposes the self-determined act of the will. We have to distinguish between pure volition and freedom. In choosing to do wrong the will, correctly speaking, is not free. Voluntary the act is; but no more. In choosing the wrong or the false, the will becomes enslaved. For falsehood and wrong violate the immanent law of personality. Says our Lord: "Every one that committeth sin is the bond-servant of sin."† Personality is constituted for doing and knowing truth and right. Like light for the eye, like bread for the body, the True and the Right are the necessary food of personality. When the objective Truth and Right are appropriated by volition and conduct personality is nourished by the only aliment which qualifies personality to realize its ideal. It becomes true by appropriating the Truth; it becomes right by doing the Right; it becomes free by taking in and living on the contents of freedom.

In one respect, therefore, it is not Christian to say good works proceed from human will. If the action of will be divorced from Jesus Christ, the objective Truth, no good works proceed from human will. The position and relations of personality being abnormal, all words spoken and all deeds done are wanting in the essential quality of Christian goodness. Such

* John 8: 36.

† John 8: 34.

words and deeds are by 'Hebrews' pronounced 'dead works;' * they are wanting alike in divine life and in ideal human life. Paul calls them 'the unfruitful works of darkness.' † Inspired by the kingdom of Evil, they are not the genuine fruit of personality.

In another respect, however, good works do proceed from the human will. Voluntary action is essential. If, receiving the Son, a person is made free by virtue of the Truth, his will becomes active according to the law of Truth. Then words spoken and deeds done, though imperfect when judged by the 'perfect law of liberty,' ‡ partake of the quality of Christian truth, and so far forth they are good fruit, growing on 'a good tree.'

Faith is the organ of the Christian soul. Like the eye, faith sees the Truth; like the hand, it lays hold of and cleaves to the Truth; like the mouth, faith feeds on the Truth. It is the organ by which Jesus Christ becomes one with personality, and personality derives from Him the disposition and the power to do the good. He says in His sacerdotal prayer: The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one. § In another place He says: I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in Me, and I in him the same beareth much fruit: for apart from Me ye can do nothing. || Apart from Him no one bears the fruit of good works; He is the original motive of all genuine goodness.

True faith is the only subjective principle of good works inasmuch as Christ through the Spirit becomes the new life of personality only when the believer by the responsive act of his will accepts Christ as the law of moral action. Then, emancipated from the condemnation of sin and living in the peace of God, he breathes the exhilarating atmosphere of spiritual freedom. Moved from within by the love of righteousness he takes

* Heb. 9: 14.

† Eph. 5: 11.

‡ James 1: 25.

§ John 17: 22, 23.

|| John 15: 5.

"delight in the law of the Lord," as the bodily eye rejoices in the light of the sun, or the ear in the harmonies of music, or as a dutiful son glories in the service of his mother. So far from making good works the ground of a claim upon God, the works of the believer are an offering of thankfulness for the great grace which has accepted him through faith in Christ "apart from the works of the law." His "great recompense of reward" * consists in doing the will of his Father in heaven.

III.—WORKS DONE ACCORDING TO THE LAW OF GOD.

The believer needs a critical standard of judgment. The question arises: What words, what deeds are right? What are wrong? He may not violate his conscience; but the conscience needs an objective regulator, and that is Law.

The second element of good works consists in this, that they are done according to the law of God. Neither the motive nor the end sanctifies the means.

The Christian conscience is the organ for the right, an inalienable endowment of personality. Conscience is threefold: a faculty, answering to the self-determination of will; a perception, answering to intellectual and rational life; a sense, answering to feeling conditioned on perception or volition.

As a faculty, conscience is the will-power to choose the right and do the right; the power to choose and do the wrong. As intellectual perception conscience discerns the moral order of the world, as living within and existing without, from which arises the idea of the objective right, of obligation and duty. As the sense of right, conscience begets the feeling of self-approval when the right is chosen and done, begets the feeling of self-condemnation when the wrong is done, or the right is left undone. Moral faculty, moral perception, moral feeling, are different but inseparable moments of the same endowment. Each is potential in nascent personality. As personality awakes and develops, each is a force in every motion of the conscience.

* Heb. 10: 35. Rom. 12: 1-3.

Every act of personality involves some moral power, some moral intelligence, some moral feeling; though one form of the action of conscience may predominate over another form.

But the conscience does not beget the Right, nor impose obligation. The moral order of the world antedates conscience. Man has a conscience because there is a moral order. Truth and Right are primarily objective. Right addresses us from the constitution of Christianity, and from the constitution of the human kingdom, especially from the personality of the Christian man. If the light within be not darkness, if the eye of the soul be sound, the conscience sees the Right, and by contrast recognizes the wrong. But in consequence of the moral disorganization of the Adamic race, and the imperfections of the members of Christ, all intuitive judgments concerning the right are only partially correct. The best moral judgment is not purely good. The eye of the Christian soul is dim. Conscience comes to clearer and fuller perception of what the objective Right is only by a slow process; and when the Right is seen with some degree of clearness, Christian personality lacks the adequate power perfectly to do the Right. Sometimes judgment mistakes the Right for the wrong, or the wrong for the Right; and the conscience may condemn when a person has done that which in itself is right, or the conscience may fail to condemn when a person proposes to do, or has done, the deed which in itself is wrong.

Though the organ for the Right, the organ which fundamentally distinguishes personality from all impersonal creatures, yet conscience is not the objective standard for its decisions. That standard is the revealed Will of God; that Will, first, as expressed by the most perfect moral code, the Ten Commandments; then, that Will embodied and expressed by the ideal personal history of the Son of Man, an expression of authority which complements and transcends the Ten Commandments.

The authority of the righteous life of Jesus Christ, as final law for Christian personality, is at issue with the errors of moral judgment respecting obligations to God and duties to man, inherited from paganism or from Judaism, and with the

errors always arising from the imperfection of Christian judgment. In the endeavor to answer moral questions the problem consists in the just interpretation of the perfect law of God in its application to the varying conditions of family life, social life, civil life, ecclesiastical life. Whilst the Church may never fail to emphasize the Good and the True as developed in past centuries, and may never silence the dictates of the individual conscience, or the common conscience of her membership, yet she may never look within for the law of moral conduct. Tradition and custom are ever to be tested by the objective Right as expressed by the objective law. The ethical life of the Son of Man is perpetually the Object of study with an open mind, a mind free from prejudice or prepossession. Then the Ten Commandments, complemented and perfected by righteous love realized in Jesus Christ, become year by year an actual power in the progress of the Church, correcting the moral judgment and ennobling the moral life. As the moral life rises, as the moral judgment advances, the conscience will obtain clearer vision of the objective Right, and become a mightier motive.

The only criterion of judgment, the only rule of action, is the Law of God. An action proceeding from true faith is so far forth good. So is an action as regards its proposed end good, which is done for the glory of God. But an action may proceed from the true principle of moral goodness, and it may aim at the true end, yet it may not in reality be a good work. If the standard of judgment be false or inadequate, a person may perform a work in itself wrong from a right motive, or a work in itself wrong for an end in itself good; a contradiction arising from the ethical disorganization of the Adamic race, the consequences of which invade the ethical life of the Christian, and impair the worthiness of his conduct. The same contradiction may appear when the standard of right is true, but the moral judgment is at fault. Two things are therefore necessary: 1. The law of God, the ultimate and universal criterion of Right; 2. A correct moral judgment, respecting the requirements of the law in its application to conduct.

Sound Christian ethics must deny that the end sanctifies the means, or that the means are right because the end is good. Ethics enjoins that only right means, means approved by the law of God, be employed to accomplish an end, no matter how noble the end or how obligatory its accomplishment. Christianity tolerates no conduct, no motives, no transactions that contravene the righteousness of God. We have indeed to distinguish between religious life and good works, between faith in Christ and morality; but we cannot sever the two things without injury to both. Religion is essential to good works. Without religion works lack vitality and substance. On the other hand, good works are the expression of religious life. If works are not good, not approved by the law of God, religious life, for lack of normal development in action, is weak and sickly. Or if works are done according to a false standard, or governed by a false moral judgment, not only is religious life misdirected, but it is poisoned by the virus of moral evil. Hence the necessity and significance of the Decalogue for the Abrahamic people. Hence, too, the fundamental necessity and infinite worth of the sinless, holy life of Jesus Christ for the ethics of Christianity, and the ethical character of Christian people.

A correct doctrine respecting the law of God in its bearing on Christian life and conduct excludes the errors of Legalism and Antinomianism.

Legalism lays false stress on the law, ignoring the value of the other two moments of good works. Overlooking the truth that faith in Christ is the only principle from which a work in the Christian sense good may grow forth, it resolves this principle into volition, into a firm resolve to act conformably to the demands of law, a resolve which has in it an element of stoicism. Legalism emphasizes both the letter of the law and external conformity to the letter. The most prominent representatives of legalism were the sect of the Pharisees. The severity and hardness of Pharisaic morality our Lord represents by the conduct of the elder brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son. Genuine faith may co-exist with legalism;

but the life of faith of the Christian Church, if dominated by the Pharisaic spirit, becomes a caricature of the Christian religion. Failing to distinguish between sinfulness and the personality of the sinner, it becomes harsh and extreme in its condemnatory judgment of men; and instead of illustrating the love and mercy of Calvary it delights in the lightning and thunder of Sinai.

Legalism founders on the rock of Scylla; Antinomianism is engulfed in the whirlpool of Charybdis. Whilst the one makes false account of the law, the other ignores its necessity. Antinomianism puts false stress on the sovereign grace of God. The emphasis is not excessive, not too great in degree; but grace is falsely apprehended and falsely applied. The grace of God in Christ requires not only acceptance by faith, but requires a faith in Christ that works through love to Him; and love to Him keeps His commandments.* If love developed from faith does not keep His commandments, or is indifferent to righteousness of life, it is not Christian love; and where there is no Christian love there is no true Christian faith. In the interpretation of Paul's doctrine of Justification by faith apart from the works of the law, as set forth in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, antinomianism confounds the obligation of the ceremonial law binding the Jew, an obligation which Christianity has superseded and abolished, with the universal and unchangeable obligation of moral law, which Christianity not only recognizes, but has perfected and enthroned by the faultless righteousness of Jesus Christ. Both errors are referable to a defective conception respecting the relation between the authority of law and the necessity of faith.

IV.—WORKS DONE FOR GOD'S GLORY.

The aim of works truly good is the glory of God, the manifestation of God's righteous love. Righteous love is manifested inasmuch as good works are the realization of the divine genius

* Jno. 14: 15; 15: 12.

of righteous love. Faith in Christ, inspiring action according to the law of God, unfolds into full bloom. The bloom of faith is God's glory.

Divine faith and divine glory, if each be ideal, are related like a field sown in wheat and the golden harvest. Faith is the vital principle; God's glory is its legitimate product. The manifestation of God's righteous love by good works pre-supposes the divine vitality of the Christian, a vitality nourished by the fellowship of faith with Christ. Without me, He says, ye can do nothing; ye can bear no fruit. If the vitality of faith develops itself according to the law of faith the fruit declares the moral excellence of grace.

The glory of God is not an unsubstantial display of a purpose by words or by influence. Glory implies an actual existence, a reality, which itself is a concrete revelation of God. A full-blown rose is the glory of the stalk; clusters of grapes are the glory of the vine; St. Peter's, the magnificent temple of God in Rome, is the glory of Michael Angelo. Somewhat analogous to these facts is the Son of Man. He is the ideal glory of God. The members of Christ, who honor the law as realized by His righteous life, are the glory of Christ. What He is as the Saviour from sin, as the ideal Man, becomes manifest in men. Of Himself He says: He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father. The practical aim of Christianity is this: that it may be said of all His followers what we may say of the Apostle John: He that hath seen the beloved disciple hath seen Christ. Just in the proportion that the Christian is Christlike, that He is a partaker of His anointing, that he steadfastly confesses His name, that in truth he presents himself a living sacrifice of thankfulness to Him, and with free conscience fights against sin and the devil, he becomes the glory of Christ.* His works glorify God inasmuch as his words and his deeds are a genuine exhibition of God, of truth and wisdom, of love and righteousness.

Such works are not the product of the natural human will;

* Heid. C'm., 32.

nor of the nominal Christian; nor even of the true Christian, if we conceive him to be an isolated personality sustaining no vital connection with the Fountain of life. Such works are the product only of the fellowship of living faith with Christ glorified; directed and shaped throughout by conscientious regard for the universal authority of moral law.

If, however, the doctrine concerning good works only maintains that works exhibit the excellence of God's righteous love, though so far forth valid, it does not completely express the idea of moral goodness. It is necessary to supplement this conception by saying that the person who, living by faith in Christ, conforms his conduct to the law of God, makes God's glory his fixed aim *consciously*. It is his deliberate purpose to be Christlike, to do what the law enjoins, not to the end that his conduct may exalt himself, not that he may secure position and influence, but that God may in reality be set forth by him before the world as God has been set forth by Jesus Christ, who is the archetype of Christian faith and Christian conduct. Good works do not minister to spiritual pride or vanity. They are attended by modesty, and minister to humility. So let your light shine before men that in your good works they may see the glory of your Father in heaven.

V.—CONCLUSION.

A 'good work' includes these three factors: 'true faith,' conformity to moral 'law,' and the 'glory' of God. Each element is necessary.

If true faith be wanting works are not rooted in Truth. For want of faith in Christ the person does not stand in right judicial relation to God. He is under the condemnation of unbelief. This false attitude toward God vitiates volition and conduct.

If a person has true faith, but is not governed by a conscientious regard for the law of God, works lack the genuine substance of goodness. God's law is the truth of human freedom; and the law, whether addressing the conscience from without or revealing itself from within, becomes the truth of freedom,

the content of works, only by obedience. He who chooses and fulfils the law does works which the law energizes and inhabits.

If a person has true faith and honors the law, but his works are not done for the glory of God, his moral activity is misdirected. The right motive is wanting. The aim of volition is a false aim; and a false aim of a moral agent reacts upon the life of personality, and therefore also upon conduct, exerting a vitiating influence even upon an approved standing before God. Indeed if the aim of a moral agent be the glory of self, or the possession of the world, justifying faith cannot inspire conduct according to the law of faith. There is a contradiction of personality with itself which enfeebles 'the spiritual man' and sullies the purity of moral action.

In the degree that these three factors are active in due proportion the new life of 'the spiritual man' will grow in vigor and moral beauty; and the process of sanctification will advance step by step toward perfection.

Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., August 11, 1893.

III.

OUR RELATION TO GERMAN THEOLOGY.*

BY REV. WILLIAM RUPP, D.D.

IN our day no apology will be needed on the part of any theologian or scholar for any acquaintance with German learning and German methods of thought. Among English scholars such acquaintance is no longer exceptional, but has become the rule. The depth and thoroughness of German scholarship, in all departments of thought, are recognized and honored by a rapidly increasing number of students both in England and America. The effects of this influence of German thought are perceptible in all the most recent productions of the English mind. English books and periodicals are replete with the results of German learning. No important publication, either in the domain of science, philosophy or theology, now issues from the press without showing an influence of German thought.

* This paper was read as an address at the Centennial Convention of the Pittsburgh Synod, held in Grace Reformed Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., April 27, 1893. It is now published with a few slight additions, and some notes. It may be proper to premise that the pronoun "our" in the title, is intended to refer not merely to the writer, but to the whole Reformed Church in the United States. If to any persons it should appear presumptuous that the writer should thus undertake to speak for his Church, they are reminded that this is done merely in the ordinary sense in which such performances are usually understood. What is meant is that in the writer's *opinion* the attitude of the Reformed Church in relation to the theological thought of Germany is in *the main* such as is here represented. There are doubtless some who will dissent from this opinion; and there are currents of thought in our Church which are not in agreement with this representation. But these, in the writer's full conviction, are mere eddies in the stream, and not the stream itself.

and scholarship. All the leading English theological publications of recent times bristle on almost every page with references to German works. And no work of any consequence is published in Germany without appearing at once also in an English dress.

In these circumstances surely no member of the Reformed Church need blush to own an affinity with German religious thought and theology. It is no disgrace to acknowledge intellectual fellowship with men like Herder, Schleiermacher, Neander, Tholuck, Chlshausen, Rothe, Lange, Dorner, and a host of others, whose names have become household words in the theological world of Great Britain as well as of Germany. Nor need we be ashamed of the history of German Christianity and of German religious life. That history suffers nothing in comparison with the religious history of England or of Scotland. German Protestantism has not only led the way in the progress of theological thought, but has been foremost also in the development of the Christian virtues of charity and benevolence.

The Reformed Church in the United States is a Church pre-vaillingly German in her origin, and should, therefore, be expected to sustain an intimate relation of affinity to German theology. She is, indeed, a *Reformed* Church, and therefore, allied more or less closely to the Protestant Churches outside of Germany, especially in Switzerland, France, Holland and England. Yet she was born on German soil; and the original bent of her genius and character were determined by German religious influences. Her Catechism, which is her only confession of faith—a true confession of *faith*, and not a dogmatic system—and her original Liturgy, which is still the general type of her order of worship, are productions, not of the French or Dutch, but of the German mind. Frederick III., under whose auspices they were produced, was a German prince; and their authors, Zacharias Ursinus and Casper Olevianus, were German theologians, educated in German schools and animated by German feelings and aspirations. Olevianus, indeed, was more directly a disciple of Calvin; but Ursinus, the principle author

of the Catechism, was a pupil and friend of Melancthon, under whose direction the Palatinate was led originally to accept the Protestant faith, and whose influence had, to say the least, as much to do with the determination of its religious life and thought, as had that of Zwingli or Calvin.*

The main bulk of the membership of our Reformed Church is of German descent. Intermixed with it there is, indeed, a large Swiss element, which, however, is itself constitutionally German, and also no inconsiderable element that is of French origin. English, Scotch and Irish names also appear on the records of most of our congregations. These have come to be there partly in consequence of intermarriages in the older settlements of the country, and partly in consequence of the missionary operations which the Church has carried on more recently in the newer cities and towns.† But the great majority of our members are doubtless of German origin. They are the descendants of those immigrants who came to this country, from the Palatinate and adjacent German lands, in great numbers, during the eighteenth century, in consequence of the religious wars and persecutions which devastated their homes and embittered

* The fact that Ursinus was a believer in Calvin's doctrine of predestination, as is shown in his commentary on the Catechism, does not militate against the above statement. This doctrine was taken from Augustine, along with his whole anthropology, without discussion, by all the Reformers, and held with more or less conscious determination by all of them. It was not then a matter of controversy, and did not serve as an occasion of division among Protestants. That distinction belonged only to the doctrine of the sacraments. The doctrine of predestination became a subject of strife only a century after the commencement of the Reformation; and then only did it begin to serve as an occasion for the formation of opposing parties in the Church.

† Some of the most active, intelligent, and devoted members of our Church perhaps do not bear German names. Nevertheless they are thoroughly pervaded by her peculiar life and spirit. This proves that her theology, her customs, and her religious life are adapted to other classes of minds besides the German, and that her mission is not confined simply to taking care of the German immigrants that may come to our shores. The door of entrance is open to the Reformed Church on the same conditions as to others, and she is under the same obligation to go in and preach the Gospel to the destitute as others are.

their lives. They came here, not for their country's good, as so many others have come in later times, nor merely for the sake of improving their temporal condition, but like most of their English neighbors in this new world, who had come during the reign of the Stuarts, for the sake of religious freedom and peace. They came in order that they might be permitted to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences and the rites of the Reformed Church.

In respect of language this original element of our Church has for the most part long since ceased to be German and become English, in this regard yielding to the inevitable influence and pressure of the surrounding national life. This change, though eminently reasonable and right, did not take place without resistance, and in some cases only after much bitterness and loss. Prolonged dialectic isolation had an unfavorable influence upon the Church in respect of general culture and of religious life. And it was the occasion also of no small loss to her membership. Some of her best members, in places where she came in contact with her English neighbors, and where the most intelligence and activity existed, were compelled from time to time to connect with other churches, because they no longer understood the German tongue, which nevertheless was still exclusively adhered to in the conduct of her worship. The change from the German to the English language, when, after the establishment of our literary and theological institutions, it came to take place, was found not to involve any sacrifice of the original life and genius of the Church, but rather to quicken and conserve the same. Instead of sacrificing the Church to the language, as some proposed to do, the language was sacrificed that the Church might live—a sacrifice surely that should not be regretted, however much one may love the tongue of Schiller and Goethe.

The separation of our Church, one hundred years ago, from the Church of Holland, to which for forty-six years she had stood in a relation of dependence, was a necessary condition of subsequent development in harmony with her original genius

and in correspondence with the progress of theological thought in the German fatherland. This separation, which is now the subject of our celebration, was not an arbitrary or willful breaking up of a beneficent relation. On the contrary, it was a historical and providential necessity, for which we now owe no apology, which calls for no repentance, and for the fruits of which we have reason to be thankful. The kindness of the Church of Holland shown towards the German Reformed churches in America, by extending to them material aid at a time when the Reformed Church in Germany was powerless to help them, and by exercising over them, for a time, a salutary and always a well-meant supervision, will indeed always demand of us grateful recognition. But that this was a relation that could not subsist always, and that while it did subsist it did not always produce the most beneficent results, must be obvious to any candid student of history.* The Dutch and the Germans did not understand each other's language, and this occasioned difficulties in the way of correspondence. And besides, though both were Reformed, their religious spirit and customs were not just the same. The Church of Holland had become Calvinistic in the sense in which this term has been understood since the time of the Arminian controversy, while the German Reformed Church was at most only Calvinistic in the sixteenth century sense of the term. A separation was, therefore, a historical necessity. If the German Reformed Church had continued to be controlled by the Church of Holland, and if this control had been real and not merely nominal, she would gradually have lost her original peculiarity, and become merely an insignificant branch of the general Calvinistic body of this country, for whose separate existence there would now be no

*That the dependence upon Holland did not tend to the most rapid development of the German Reformed Church is evident from the fact that, during the whole period of its duration, the number of ministers increased only from five to nineteen. This number was, of course, totally inadequate to take care of the many thousands of Reformed people who were in the country during that time. And the question of providing ministers for the many shepherdless congregations was one of the difficulties which led to the separation.

good reason. The hope may be entertained that some day the Dutch and German Reformed Churches will be one; but if they ever do unite, we may be sure that it will not be on the basis of Dutch Calvinism, but on the ground of some higher principle.*

One immediate result of the preservation of our separate and independent existence as a Church of German origin, is the retention of German depth and German geniality in our theological thinking and in our church life. While we may have gained something of the acuteness of the French mind from the Huguenots incorporated with us, and while we may have imbibed much of the practical common sense of the English, in consequence of the adoption of their language with its treasures of thought and sentiment, we have preserved also as a Church our German *Gemüthlichkeit*, our German depth and heartiness of feeling, as well as strength and keenness of intellect.

And it is doubtless this peculiarity of the German spirit that has preserved us from the one-sidedness and harshness of that extreme Puritanism which has at times disfigured the Reformed Churches in other lands and of other nationalities. From the spirit of German theology we have inherited that tendency to churchliness and to the recognition of the objective element in religion, which has saved our piety from the extremes of subjectivism and fanaticism, that have at times devastated the religious world around us. We have, for example, never permitted our altars to be removed from our sanctuaries. We have in general preserved the old and churchly style of archi-

*The recent rejection of the proposition of federal union by the Dutch Reformed Church has occasioned no little surprise among us. But before we blame them very much for it, we should consider whether, from the standpoint of the Dutch Church, it was not after all the right and proper thing to do. The union was not to affect their standing as modern Calvinists, nor our standing as Calvinists merely after the German or sixteenth century fashion; and they might, therefore, well be fearful that the thing would not work well. But even if it had been proposed that we should become Calvinists after their sort, what religious ground would there have been for such a union? Would not, in that case, a union with the Presbyterian Church be far more reasonable?

texture in our houses of worship. We have never questioned the permissibility of church bells and of organs, nor the lawfulness of the use of hymns of modern origin. We have always believed in the reality and efficacy of sacramental grace, and in the propriety and advantages of educational religion. We have never parted with our love or taste for liturgical worship, the worship of God by all the people in the beauty of holiness. We have never forgotten the Church year, with its sacred days, and solemn festivals, and inspiring lessons, and stirring hymns, and sublime prayers. We have never ceased to practice catechization and confirmation as the best method of bringing our young people into the full communion of the Church. Under the pressure of adverse foreign influences one or other of these peculiar elements of our religious faith and life may at times have been neglected. But they have always been dear to the heart of the Church, and could therefore never be entirely abandoned or forgotten. And it is our pleasure now to observe that a restoration of these religious ideas and practices is taking place even in denominations which once seemed to be entirely estranged from them.*

Another advantage which we doubtless owe to our relation to German theology is that we have now, in this time of universal clarification of theological thought, no "Calvinistic

- * There exists at the present moment a growing sense of *churchliness* among most of the denominations of this country, which manifests itself in increased reverence for the *idea* of the Church, in increased importance attached to the sacraments, in renewed honor put upon the church festivals, and especially in the extensive introduction of more or less liturgical forms of worship into the services both of Sunday-schools and congregations. These things are no longer regarded as relics of popery, to be abolished as quickly as possible. It is coming to be understood more and more that the right way to resist Romanism is
- not to deny the truth which is in Romanism, but rather to separate it from the unrighteousness in which it is held there, and to hold it in its simplicity and purity. The strength of a false ecclesiasticism is in the truth which lies at its foundation. The quality of *churchliness* is an essential quality of Christianity, of which a *mechanical ecclesiasticism*, such as we find in Romanism, and only in a less degree in modern Episcopalianism, is merely a perversion. It is the honor of the Reformed Church that she has, as a rule, held to the truth, while she has rejected the perversion.

system" to defend and save at the risk of our ecclesiastical existence or Christian character. Understanding by Calvinism the decretal system inherited from Augustine, together with its presuppositions and implications, we affirm that the German Reformed Church is not now, and never has been, Calvinistic. In the Reformed Church of Germany, as Ebrard showed long ago, this system never took strong or permanent root.* The sacramental views of Calvin, especially his views of the Lord's Supper, were heartily accepted; and this fact, together with what it involves, separates our Church from the Churches of the Lutheran confession. But, as has frequently been observed, there is an inner contradiction between the sacramental and the decretal systems, which makes them mutually exclusive, although they may at times have existed together in the same minds, as they did in Augustine's and in Calvin's. In consequence of this contradiction the sacramental system expelled the decretal system in Germany, while elsewhere the reverse has been the case. It is true, indeed, that the doctrine of the decrees was taught by German theologians, especially those of the Scholastic school of the seventeenth century; but, to use an expression of Ebrard's, they "encrusted" it in their systems, as a mollusk encrusts a grain of sand in its shell, and thus made it harmless; while other schools passed it by or refused to discuss it altogether.

But, however, it may have been at an earlier time, in German

* See Ebrard's *Dogmatik*, §§ 27, 36. Of the German Reformed theologians who were present at the Synod of Dort, many dissented from the views of the majority, and afterwards altogether disregarded the authority of the Synod. One delegate from Bremen, Dr. Martinus, is said in his old age to have exclaimed, "O Dort, O Dort! would God that I had never seen thee!" See Herzog's *Real Enc.* Vol. III., p. 489. It need scarcely be remarked in this connection that neither the Reformed Church of Germany nor her daughter in the United States is an *Arminian* Church. Arminianism, the doctrine of an eternal decree predestinating unto salvation, out of the mass of fallen humanity, those who believe in Christ (*ob fidem pravisam*) is not a solution of the difficulties of Calvinism. That solution can only be reached, if reached at all, in a new theological system whose controlling principle shall be, not the idea of divine sovereignty, but the idea of the person of Christ.

theology the Calvinistic system perished utterly in the rationalistic revolution of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries, and in the *renaissance* which followed afterwards. It perished, moreover, never to be revived on German soil, except as a curiosity, and in sporadic form. From the influence of the German rationalism, especially of the school of Semler, Paulus and Reimarus, which was indeed in a large measure a legitimate reaction against the dead orthodoxism of a former period, the American Church was preserved by her *isolation*. There was at that time so little intellectual communion between the mind of the Church in America and that of the German fatherland, that the processes which were going on in the latter were little felt by the former. Men seldom crossed the ocean in either direction. It was not a time in which there was much traveling, nor a time of much immigration. And of books not many were imported; and even if there had been, they would not have been generally understood in the intellectual condition which prevailed here from 1793 to 1825.

When, after the establishment of our theological and literary institutions in this country, intercourse on any considerable scale with Europe was renewed, a new theology had been created there, which was in many respects different from the orthodox systems of former times. The great systems of philosophy also had been developed and published to the world—the systems of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel—which, though they may contain much that is fanciful, have nevertheless given a new direction and method to the operations of the human mind for all time to come. And in connection with the new philosophy there had grown up, on the ruins of the older systems, a new theology, elaborated and fostered by such men as Schleiermacher, Neander, and their disciples—a theology which, while true to the old faith, was in thorough touch also with the spirit of modern life and thought—a theology which was as devout as it was scientific, and as scientific as it was devout, and which satisfied for the time at least the new demands of the human reason.

With this new theology of Germany our Church has, since the establishment of her institutions of learning, been in relations of sympathetic correspondence. The first president of Marshall College, Dr. F. A. Rauch, was a representative of this new theology—a pupil of Daub, a disciple of Schleiermacher, and a student of Schelling and Hegel. And though Dr. Rauch died being yet comparatively a young man, he succeeded in giving to the educational institutions, and to the philosophical and theological thinking of the Church, a direction and tendency which they ever since have followed. The eyes of the Church then were directed mainly towards Germany for theological teachers as well as for theological light and truth. When a professor was wanted for our new Seminary at Mercersburg, the Synod sent for Dr. Frederick W. Krummacker, but in the providence of God we obtained Dr. Philip Schaff. Krummacker was doubtless an eloquent preacher, and an able, pious man; but he was a reactionist in theology—a representative of the old order of thought, who could see no good in the “neology” of his time, and who celebrated in rapt effusions the “union of the throne and the altar;” resembling in these respects his co-temporary and co-worker Hengstenberg, from whom he differed only in that the latter was a Lutheran while he was a Calvinist. If we had gotten Krummacker, and if he had not died of homesickness in the free and democratic air of young America, the history of our Church would doubtless have been different from what it has been, and our present position would be different from what it is. But we got Schaff, and the world knows the result.

In the new German theology the central, the organizing principle is not the idea of election or of divine sovereignty, nor either the idea of justification through faith, but the idea of the incarnation or of the person of Christ. In this respect it is in harmony with the Heidelberg Catechism, which, in consequence of the controlling influence over the connection and exposition of its doctrines exercised by the Apostles' Creed, is sub-

stantially a Christological confession of faith.* In the apprehension of the new German theology the essence of Christianity is not doctrine or law promulgated directly from heaven, but a divine-human life in Christ. Christ Himself is in a profound sense the substance of the religion which He came into the world to establish.† And Christ's coming into the world was not a mere accident; nor did He come simply as a make-shift in order to the recovery of the world from the evil of sin. Christ is central in the counsels of God, central in the constitution of humanity, central in Christianity, and therefore He must of necessity also be central in theology. This is the peculiar conception which characterises the new German theology from Schleiermacher to Dörner. And this Christo-centric conception has regenerated the whole system of Christian doctrine and made all things therein new. Not only the doctrine of God, but also the doctrine of man has received a new interpretation and new significance. The old doctrines of the divine fatherhood, of creation and providence, of sin and of grace, of atonement and justification, of regeneration and sanctification, of the Church and sacraments, and especially the doctrine of the last things, have all been affected by the force of this new principle, and have been thereby placed in new light.

* The Heidelberg Catechism is a true *confession of faith*, not a doctrinal or dogmatic system; differing in this respect, for example, from the Westminster Confession, which deals, in the way of definition, with the most difficult questions of metaphysical theology. This is the reason, too, that there is now such an urgent demand for the revision of the Westminster Confession, while there is no such demand for a revision of the Catechism. The theological definitions of the one have been outgrown by the mind of the Church, while the essential articles of faith of the other can never be outgrown. It is true, of course, that the Catechism, too, bears upon it some of the marks of its age. There may be in it some statements which transcend the proper limits of a confession of faith. It reflects, moreover, some doctrinal positions of its age, which were not then prominent, and which have since been somewhat modified. But the pervasion of it by the spirit of the Apostles' Creed, which is the Christological spirit of the early Greek Church, makes it essentially a Christological confession of faith, that will be true for all time.

† "Der eigentliche Inhalt des Christenthums ist aber ganz und gar die Person Christi."—Schelling.

This idea of the centrality of Christ in Christianity is the root idea of that "new theology" which now prevails to a considerable extent in New England, and which has occasioned so much consternation and called forth so much contradiction in various parts of the land. Though we may detect what we believe to be deficiencies in the exposition of the "new theology" in this country, yet we hail it as a sign of promise, because its leading idea is one with which we have long been familiar, and because we believe this to be the true principle of a sound and scriptural system of Christian theology. There was a time, indeed, when the idea of a Christo-centric theology was ridiculed even among ourselves, and sneered at as a mere private conceit of some discontented minds. But that time is past; and we have the satisfaction now of seeing our Christo-centric conception adopted in the most influential circles of American theological thought. It would doubtless be a mark of vanity in us to say that we have given this principle to the theological thought of this country. To some extent, indeed, this would be true. Drs. Nevin and Schaff bore witness to this principle at a time when few men were willing to receive their witness, and when by many it was supposed to be nothing more than a new form of German transcendentalism or mysticism, that no sound English brain could comprehend. But the new idea, with some of its most important corollaries, has at last gained admission to some of the leading schools of theology in the country; and it may even be gratifying to us to know that they have received it from the same source from which we had received it at an earlier time, namely, *the new theology of Germany*.

This Christological principle will ultimately prove to be the unifying principle of the Church. The unifying, organizing principle which will at some time make one the various Christian denominations of this country, will not be the doctrine of the divine decrees, nor the doctrine of free-will, nor the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture; nor will it be the institution either of episcopacy or of presbyterialism. We are bound, because of our Christological principle, to sympathize with the

unionistic tendencies of our time; but we are bound also to confess that we can not have much sympathy or even respect for the various plans of union that have as yet been proposed. Church union, we believe, will never be brought to pass, on any extensive scale, on the mere basis of similarity of polity, or of cultus, or of doctrine; nor either on the basis of the identity of a name, like Reformed, or Lutheran, or Methodist. We may be more hopeful in regard to the results which are likely to follow from union in practical Christian work—work for Christ and His kingdom, and for the salvation of the masses and the amelioration of their condition. Such work has for its motive love to Christ, whether Christ be regarded in His own person, or more in the persons of other men, according to Matt. 25 : 31-46; and such love to Christ lies nearer to the heart of the Christological principle than any mere devotion to a doctrine or form of government does, and will tend also to beget that divine charity without which all our works are nothing worth, and without which certainly there can be no church union.*

*There exists at the present time a considerable degree of unity in German Christianity, in spite of the wide divergencies of different schools of theology. The differences of theological views have not in Germany so generally led to the organization of separate sects, as in England and America. This difference could not be ascribed entirely to the difference in the attitude of the State in relation to the Church among the two nationalities respectively; for the pressure of the government upon the Church has in the past been, to say the least, as heavy in Great Britain as in Germany. The difference is usually supposed to be due to a more practical turn of the English mind as compared with the German. In the English mind the will, in the German the intellect is relatively the stronger. Hence the Englishman proceeds generally to embody his ideas in outward institutions, while the German is content to build them up into intellectual systems. There is doubtless a degree of truth in this representation; for the German evidently attributes less importance to pure doctrines or abstract notions in the practical life of religion than the Englishman does. But whether for this reason the German mind should be said to be less *practical* than the English is another question. However this may be, the German habit is in this particular nearer to the habit of original Christianity than the English. In the original Christianity of Christ and the Apostles the centre of gravity lay not in the sphere of doctrine, but in the sphere of practice, or of morality. The subsequent shifting of this centre of gravity from morality to doctrine, or from the heart to the intellect, was due to the

Our Christological habit of thought, according to which we find the foundation of Christianity, not in the Bible, but in Christ Himself, enables us to look with complacency upon the operations and results of modern Biblical criticism. Biblical criticism, at least the higher criticism, though no longer cultivated exclusively by German scholars, owes its origin to German learning, German patience and German love of truth. The German theologian, as a rule, is not afraid of the truth. The truth can do no harm; and the German scholar in his investigations is usually little controlled by advance considerations of "consequences." There is one consequence which no criticism of the Bible can lead to: it can never take away the ever-living and present Christ from the heart of the Christian believer. Believing, then, and being sure that Christ is the truth, and that He has the words of eternal life, we need not be greatly disturbed if errors should be discovered in the geography, or history, or science of the Bible. We shall be able to be Christians, and to believe in the general trustworthiness of the Gospel, in spite of all that; and we shall not cry out that we have lost our Lord, if our theories of inspiration are disturbed. Wellhausen, from what we are

influence of the Greek mind. The strict maintenance of intellectual formulas concerning Christ then became a matter of more importance in regard to church relations than love to Christ was supposed to be. Now, we would not underrate the service which the Greek mind has rendered to Christianity; and we would be far from depreciating the value of sound doctrine in the development of the Christian life; but we are convinced that the Christian world must come back more to the original habit of Christianity, in the view here under consideration, before we may hope for any thing like a generally successful movement towards union among the various Christian denominations. So long as men may in one breath be pronounced good Christians and yet heretics unfit for membership in some particular denomination, there is not much hope for church union. The German habit of laying more stress upon the state of a man's heart, and less upon the opinions which he holds, which at any rate is in harmony with the habit of original Christianity, we believe to be a condition that must come to prevail far more generally than it does now, before there can be much hope for the reunion of our divided Christendom. On the relative importance of morality and doctrine in Christianity compare Hatch, "*The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*," pp. 158-170.

sometimes told about his rationalism and about his deadly errors, ought perhaps to be a monster of wickedness; yet we hear that he is a most excellent Christian gentleman. Some may not be able to see how that can be; but we are assured that so it is, nevertheless. Perhaps it is because the German makes less account than we are accustomed to do, of mere theological opinion, and more of the objective divine reality which attests itself in his consciousness, and is, for this very reason, also more disposed to exercise charity in his judgment of those who differ with him.

One of the leading characteristics of modern German theology, which has made a deep and lasting impression upon the thinking of our Church, is its *historical spirit*, or its sense for the reality and significance of historical development. This may be due, in part, to the peculiar tendency of the German mind to reverence the objective, the reality and worth of being, and in part also to the application in theological thinking of the Christological principle, which makes Christ the central idea and final cause of the world's entire life; implying that the world's life is a connected and orderly process, without breaks or leaps—a process in which one stage is always conditioned by that which precedes, while it in turn conditions that which succeeds—a process, moreover, which as embodying an element of freedom possesses an objective moral import and value. In a contemplation of the world and of human life from the standpoint of absolute divine predestination the historical process can have no real significance. Indeed, it ceases to be in any proper sense a process. History in this view becomes simply the transposition into space and time of what is eternally predetermined in the divine decrees; somewhat as in the system of Plato the world of finite things is merely a copy of the divine ideas. In this view no value can attach to history in any form. In its objective form, or sense, it is merely the mathematical product in time of the series of factors involved in the eternal decrees. The process is entirely without freedom, and, therefore, without any moral interest or meaning. It achieves

nothing but what was eternally pre-formed in the decree of creation, in which Christ Himself is involved as a single factor, whose life, therefore, comes under the same law of necessity that controls the whole process, and is like every thing else, devoid of any real moral import and value.

Nor can the study of history have any real interest in this view. For Calvinism, accordingly, Church history can have no significance; and the attachment of any value either to the history of life or of dogma, must always appear to it as heresy. It is, therefore, not without cause that until a comparatively recent period, historical theology was scarcely cultivated at all outside of German universities. We have the testimony of Dr. J. W. Nevin to the effect that, at the time when he was a student at Princeton, there was scarcely anything known there of the science of Church history. Some study of the controversy between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism was all that was thought necessary or profitable in that line. For consistent Calvinism, indeed, the truth has no history. It came into the world once for all when the Bible was composed, and it came in a manner that separates it entirely from the notion of anything like a historical process; and since its advent here its life has been simply a series of obscurations and re-discoveries, between which there has been no necessary inward relation or connection. Westminster Calvinism was simply such a disclosure of the truth contained in the Bible, whose light had been hidden for some ages, standing in no connection with anything going before, and needing nothing to follow after it. What profit, then, could there be in the study of history?

In German theology, on the contrary, history, in the objective sense of the term, is regarded as having a real significance and value. History is *Entwicklung*, *development*, *evolution*—a process possessing its own laws, and tending with unbroken continuity to a pre-determined divine end, but involving also a factor of freedom, which invests its results with a real value as possessing moral contents that were not in the beginning. This conception applies to the process of divine revelation; and the

Bible, which is the record of revelation, must consequently be in a great measure a sealed book so long as it is not approached with a historical sense and in a historical spirit. The same conception applies to the formation of doctrines and dogmas in the Church; and the present result of this process can, therefore, only be understood properly in the light of its progress in the past. The same historical conception applies also to the person and history of Christ; and hence in German we have real "lives of Christ." And the same historical conception belongs, finally, to the process of the individual Christian life. In the unhistorical view of Christianity salvation consists simply in a succession of disconnected divine operations, such as regeneration, conversion, sanctification, with which the ordinary moral life of the individual has scarcely any connection. Conversion is a sudden process brought to pass by an operation of the divine spirit, and changing the mind of a sinner into the mind of a saint; while the sinful nature still manifestly adhering to the soul is magically put aside in the moment of death. The historical view, on the other hand, emphasises the idea of the Christian life as a growth in grace, and as a continuous moral process, in which the individual will as well as the surrounding environment are significant factors, and whose result, therefore, possesses real ethical value.

In the view here under consideration our theology, the theology of our Church, is, we believe, decidedly German. But we witness with pleasure that the historical sense is beginning to assert itself also in the theological thinking of other denominations. The historical spirit and method are manifest in much of the theological literature of the day. We have the pleasant consciousness, however, that we have led the way in this matter. To us the idea of historical development has long been familiar. We believed in *Entwicklung* at a time when *Entwickelung* was regarded as a very great heresy. And because of this our general historical sense we have no trouble with the modern doctrine of evolution, which some have regarded as the very abomination of desolation in the temple of God. That doctrine,

theistically construed, is only the complement in the sphere of natural science of what we have long since regarded as true in the historical sciences. And there is nothing in it that should in the least disturb our faith. The world may have been evolved according to the laws formulated by Darwin; that does not prevent us from believing "in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." The omnipotence of the heavenly Father is the immanent force of the process by which the world has come to be; the laws which govern the movement of the process, are the determinations of His will; and Christ is the immanent, determinative idea of the process, and the end to which the whole creation tends. We have, therefore, no trouble with modern science or philosophy.* Some scientists, indeed, may be atheistic; much of our science is doubtless in conflict with seventeenth century dogmatism; but we have no quarrel with the science of the age, for we are sure that in its own way it is contributing to the glory of our Lord.

We have dwelt upon some of the peculiar features and excellencies of German theology, which are a part of our natural inheritance, and of which we would not willingly be deprived. But we are not, and ought not to be, blind worshipers of everything that is German. Germany has produced thinkers whom we are bound to repudiate, and systems of thought which we must reject. Germany has nourished a Strauss and a Bruno Bauer, who began with denying the Lord, and ended with worshiping Bismarck—a cult to which other Germans have also been devoted for some time, and which has had no particularly ennobling effect upon the German people. Germany has, moreover of late years produced a whole brood of reactionary theologians,

* The remark which Archbishop Whately once made of the manner in which many preachers treat scientific truth, we believe to be at least less applicable to those of the Reformed Church than to many others. "At first," he said, "they say that it is absurd; then they say that it contradicts the Bible; and finally they say that they have always believed it." If we have not always believed some of these things which are now generally accepted as established truths, we have at least not quarreled with them as much as some others have.

whose doctrines breathe the spirit of the Middle Ages, and who, in their enthusiasm for the "empire," have lost the power of distinguishing between the throne and the altar.* For these we have no use. We appropriate from the treasures of German thought, not blindly, but with discrimination. We try the spirits, whether they are of God, before we accept the doctrines which they may bring. As Christians it is our duty to do that. And this is a duty which must continually be exercised, and from the obligation of which there can be no escape. For spirits will continue to come, whether we will it or not—teachers who claim that they have something to tell us that we have not heard before, and that shall be for our profit. Some may think that after the Heidelberg Catechism, or at least after the Westminster Confession, a great gulf has been fixed between the source of truth and ourselves, so that those who are on that side cannot pass over to us, nor can any from our side pass over to that. That appears to be what a certain theory demands. But in spite of the most plausible theory, spirits still continue to come; and they come bringing messages for men. Now, it is not enough that we know the spirits to be German or English, orthodox or heterodox—that is to say, agreeing or disagreeing with our particular *doxas*. What we want to know is whether they confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, and whether they have anything to teach us that shall be for our edification and for the good of the Church; and if so, we are ever willing to hear and to learn; for, as Ebrard has said, it is the peculiar glory of the Reformed Church to be able to accept everything that has proven itself to be scriptural and true, no matter from what quarter it may come. Truth is one; and truth cannot conflict with truth. If, then, we possess *the truth* in its unity, we can have no difficulty in accepting and appropriating *truths* wherever we may find them. There may be denominations whose creeds are so narrow and so imperfect that they offer no points of attachment to many truths which modern

* Compare Lichtenberger's *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 358, 375, and elsewhere.

experience and modern study of the Bible have brought to light. If their members happen to light upon any such truths, they must be invited, therefore, to step out, and find homes elsewhere. The Reformed Church is not thus narrow. She has room for all truth, whether it be new or old, and whether it be preached by German or Englishman, Catholic or Protestant. She might, therefore, in this respect adopt the motto: *nihil veri a me alienum puto.*

IV.

THE AIM AND END OF THE CHURCH.

A Study on Eph. III. 16-19.

BY REV. WM. C. SCHAEFFER, PH.D.

Some one has said that in this epistle to the Ephesians the apostle Paul reached the summit level in the marvelous productions which he has given to the Church. If we had no other way to justify God's providence in taking St. Paul from his active missionary work and allowing him to languish those weary years in the prisons of Caesarea and Rome, we could find it in the ripening of heart and mind which enabled him to write this wonderful letter.

The epistle confessedly gives us St. Paul's doctrine on the Church. However much commentators may differ on other points, they are, I think, agreed on this. According to Alford, the theme of the epistle is *the ground, the course, and the aim and end of the Church of Christ*. The first three chapters contain the doctrinal portion. This very naturally falls into three parts, marked by the division of the chapters. In the first part St. Paul points out the ground and origin of the Church in the Father's eternal counsel of love, and in the carrying out of that counsel in the work of Christ and in the mission of the Holy Spirit. In the second part we are pointed to the course and progress of the Church. Here we are confronted by the mystery of the constitution of the Church, in which Jews and Gentiles, being quickened together with Christ and being made to sit with him in heavenly places, are builded up together into an holy temple in the Lord for a habitation of God through the

Spirit. The third part then takes up the aim and end of the Church. The substance of what the apostle has to say on this part is contained in the passage under consideration.

Before taking up the several points which are here presented for our consideration, it may not be amiss to remark that, while much has been written on the subjects contained in the first and second parts, much less has been said on the subject contained in the third. There has been much controversy on the Father's eternal counsel of love, in which the Church is here represented to have had its origin and ground. Much has been written on the mystery by which the Church is being builded up into an holy temple in the Lord. There has been much learned discussion on how the Church is the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all, and on how we can say that the Church is the habitation of God through the Spirit. Much less attention seems to have been given to the thought which is presented in this third part. To say the least, this is the most practical of the three general themes presented in the epistle. In our working in and for the Church, in our efforts to extend her borders at home and in heathen lands, do we always have clearly before us the aim and end of our labor? It is certainly a most pertinent question, to ask ourselves what aim and end we should constantly set before ourselves as we go on toiling from year to year in the vineyard of the Lord.

Should we attempt to answer the question simply on the basis of our own thinking, it is likely that most of us would say that our aim and end should be to save men from eternal ruin, or to prepare the bride of Christ so that he may be able at last to present her pure and unspotted before the Father's throne. Doubtless our answers would contain much that is true, yet they would fall far short of the answer which St. Paul suggests.

In the passage before us, St. Paul gives us his answer in the form of a prayer. He prays for three things: I. That the members of the Church may be strengthened with might by the Spirit, so that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith; II. That being rooted and grounded in love, they may be able to

apprehend the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge; III. That they may be filled with all the fulness of God.

We notice first of all that St. Paul makes the aim and end of the Church to consist in something which is to be attained in her members. Whatever our position may be on the old question of universals, it is well to notice that the Church as a whole reaches her aim and end only as the things here spoken of are reached in the individual members. Only as the individual stones, which go to make up the temple of God, are cut and polished and made ready for their place in the building, can the grand edifice be reared in the world. Only as the individual jewels, which go to make up the Saviour's crown, are made to reflect his glory, can that crown be made ready for his brow. This does, of course, not mean that the individual member is to be prepared and builded up in his Christian life apart from the Church, or on the outside of the kingdom of grace. We must be comprehended first of all in the mystery which is broader than ourselves, before we can begin to apprehend the mystery in which we stand and by which we are supported and nourished. Only because the Church is the fulness of him that filleth all in all, can we become filled with all the fulness of God. In the order of thought and of reality the Church as a whole comes first; but in the order of time and of historic realization the individual members come first. They must be transformed into the image of Christ, before the Church as a whole can become the bride, adorned for her husband, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. The architect has first of all the plan of the entire building in his mind, before he contemplates the stones and the material which he puts into it; but in the order of time and of realization, he cuts and dresses his stones first, and only when these are prepared each for its proper place does he rear the building. So with the temple of our God. The Saviour first called and trained a number of disciples; and only after they were prepared was the Church founded by the sending of the Holy Ghost. So of the Church as a whole. Men are called

by the Gospel, lifted up by the energies reaching out from the bosom of the kingdom; and only when they are transformed and perfected, will the Church as a whole reach its end. Hence we repeat, in the order of thought the Church is first as the bosom in which we must rest; but in the order of historic realization the individual stones are reached first, and only when each of these is prepared for its proper place in the grand edifice will the temple itself be able to reach its completion.

Hence it is said that the aim and end of the Church is found in something which is to be accomplished in the individual members. When they shall have been so strengthened with might in the inner man that Christ shall dwell in their hearts by faith; when they shall be able to apprehend the breadth and length, and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge; and when they shall have been filled with all the fulness of God; then, and not till then, can the Church in deed and in truth be the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

This, it strikes me, is a thought of much practical importance. We reach the aim and end of our ministry, and so of all Christian activity, and indeed the end of the Church's existence on earth, not by holding up before our minds some grand ideal of churchly power and excellence, not by trying to build up some grand ecclesiastical organization; but by getting down to hand to hand work in rescuing, elevating, training, and perfecting the separate and individual jewels which will make up the Saviour's crown. Our business is primarily to cut and polish the stones which are to be builded up into the temple; God will by his Spirit and providence himself see to it that they are builded and compacted together.

What then is that which is to be accomplished in the individual members in which the Church is to attain her aim and end?

I. This, in the first place, is that we may be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, so that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith. "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with

might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith."

The immediate aim of the Church's activity on earth is to reach the "inner man." St. Peter calls this "the hidden man of the heart." (1 Pet. 3: 4.) The Saviour speaks of it simply as "the heart," and sometimes as "the treasure of the heart."

What are we to understand by this "inner man," this "hidden man of the heart," this "treasure of the heart," or simple "the heart?" Evidently it must refer to that which is most important in the constitution of our being, since it is thus singled out as the end which the Church's activity aims first of all to reach. Says Tayler Lewis, "It is the strong vault of the spirit far down below the outward word and act, below the thoughts in any objective shape they may assume to our thinking consciousness. Yes, below the thoughts, we say, for they are born in it and come up out of it. 'Out of the heart come forth evil thoughts.' 'The imagination of the thoughts of the heart are evil, and evil continually.' It is deeper than any motus, movement, or acting of the soul, unless we mean that static action, force, or life which is involved in its very spiritual status or constitution; since all life, all being in fact, is inseparable from the idea of a doing or an energy in some form. It is thus not only below all doing in the motive sense, but all willing as the commencement of any spiritual movement. That which energizes in us 'both to will and to do,' be it nature or be it divine life, must be something still lower, still more interior than either the *doing* or the *willing*." "The inner man," we would then say, is the inmost, the deepest, the most hidden part of our being, the well-spring of thought, emotion and volition, that out of which come the issues of life, and accordingly that which ultimately determines what we are.

It is the aim of the Church primarily to reach this "inner man;" and if it fails in this, all other aims which it has in view are necessarily rendered impossible. And that which the Church is intended to accomplish for this "inner man" is to strengthen it with might.

This pre-supposes that this "inner man" is by nature weak, and incapable of performing the functions and duties of manhood. This accords with the uniform tenor of Scripture on the subject. "How weak is thine heart, saith the Lord, seeing that thou doest all these things." (Ezek. 16 : 30). Because the heart is weak, therefore the thought and deed falter. Strength in this part is promised to those who wait on the Lord. "Wait on the Lord : be of good courage and *he shall strengthen thine heart* : wait, I say, on the Lord." (Ps. 27 : 14). Not only is the heart weak and incapable of any good, but it is represented as the evil source whence proceed all the evils which externalize themselves in our outward life. Listen to the terrible muster-roll of the products of this "inner man !" "For from within, out of the hearts of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness : all these evil things come from within and defile the man." (St. Mark 7 : 21-23). The heart, moreover, is thus continually throwing up into our outward life such evil things only because it is itself corrupt and defiled. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked : who can know it ?" (Jer. 17 : 9). "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, and that *every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually*" (Gen. 6 : 5).

That this "inner man," so weak and so corrupt, may be strengthened with might is primarily the aim of the Church. The expression, "to be strengthened with might," seems at first sight to contain a tautology. But this is only apparent. The "inner man" is corrupt and defiled and does not have within itself any resources which can be developed into strength. It is "dead in trespasses and sins." In order that we may have power for the accomplishment of the grand purpose of life, might must be brought into the heart from beyond itself. Hence the meaning is, not to be strengthened with its own might or power, but with the might of God's Holy Spirit.

We must "be strengthened with might *by his Spirit*." The

energy must come from above; and it must be the energy of God's Holy Spirit. He alone is "the Lord, the Giver of life." He alone can give us the gift of a new and spiritual life. And as he alone can give unto us life, so can he alone afterwards strengthen our hearts. As we know from sad experience, even after we have received the gift of the new life, we must struggle all our life long against the corrupt inclinations of the flesh. The new man is not at once transformed into the perfect image of Christ; but we are born babes in Christ, and must grow and develop until at the end we reach the full measure of the stature of Christ. But for this development we need the constant help of the Holy Spirit. As the budding plant in the garden needs the constant sustenance and strength which come to it from the genial influences of the sunshine and rain and soil, so does the Christian need the help and strength which comes to his spiritual life from the presence of the kingdom of grace. But the one who mediates all the effective energies of that kingdom to the soul, is the blessed Holy Spirit.

But this strengthening of the "inner man" with the might of the Spirit is for the purpose of reaching a certain definite result in us. It is that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith. We are not simply to be made strong, but the might which we are to receive is to be of such a character as to fit us to receive Christ as a permanent guest into our hearts. St. Paul uses a compound verb to express this idea of indwelling. The simple verb *οικῶσα* means to dwell; but he uses it in composition with *κατά*, which gives the verb the force of a permanent, finished, or fixed indwelling.

The relation between the believer and his risen Lord is variously stated in the New Testament. It is represented to be of a generic character, and is thus compared to the relation between the first Adam and every subsequent member of the race. The believer shares in the risen and exalted life of the second Adam, just as every member of the human family shares in the natural life of the first Adam. (1 Cor. 15: 45-49; Col. 3: 1-3.) But this gives us only a partial representation of the

truth. The relation of the believer to his ascended Lord includes far more than is implied in this analogy of the natural relation of the first Adam to his descendants. Beyond the fact that we receive the natural life of the first Adam, we stand in no relation to him. He is not an ever-present factor in our life. His having died and passed from the stage of human existence does not now affect us. But Christ is an ever-present factor in the life of every believer. Not only did we receive our new and spiritual life from him, but this new life can continue to exist only as we constantly derive life from him. Hence our relation to him is further represented under the analogy of the vine and its branches. "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for apart from me ye can do nothing." (St. John 15: 4, 5.) The believer not only receives life from Christ, but he lives in him, so that the power and energy of Christ are ever in him as the strength by which he is enabled to do the things pertaining to his new and spiritual life. But even this does not express in full all that is implied in the believer's relation to his risen and exalted Lord. The relation is not simply that of impersonal force or impersonal life, as that is found in the vine; but it is the relation of living personalities and intelligences, so that the idea is not simply that of the relation of force to force, but of the communion of spirit with spirit. Hence beyond all that is implied in the analogies above referred to, the relation between the believer and his ascended Lord implies such spiritual communion and fellowship that the one comes really to dwell in the other. This aspect of the relation is compared by the Saviour himself to the relation subsisting between himself and the Father. "That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in

them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one." (St. John 17: 21-23). There is probably no simply earthly relation which can furnish an analogy to this side of the relation between the believer and his Lord. There is to be a permanent, personal indwelling of the risen and exalted Christ in the heart of the believer; not simply the indwelling of his power and grace, not even the indwelling of his Spirit simply, but the permanent indwelling of the personal Christ, who is exalted at the right hand of God. "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3: 20).

It is no doubt impossible for us adequately to realize all that is implied in this aspect of our relation to Christ; and yet we have constant foretastes of the blessed reality. What believer has not enjoyed moments of such spiritual uplifting that he has been conscious of a communion with his risen Lord? There are moments of transport even in the life of the most humble and barren, which gives to the Christian a sense of what is meant by such expressions, though it is difficult to find a way adequately to express or represent it. Philosophically it presents all the difficulties involved in the question of the divine immanence, added to the question of a finite spirit being able to afford a permanent abode for the infinite; but practically it is a question which is beginning to find its realization in the experience of even the most humble.

This now is the primary aim of the church on earth—to strengthen the individual member of the church with might by the Spirit, that this mystery may take place in him. And it is the aim of the church, not only that a few choice spirits here and there may rise to the realization of this grand experience, but that every one who is in the church may attain it. Certainly it is an aim worthy of an institution which is here by divine appointment; and it is high enough too to enlist all the noblest energies of consecrated men and women everywhere.

II. Has the aim and end of the church been reached, when this has been attained? St. Paul, at least, goes on to enumerate two other things which are to be attained before this end is reached. The next he puts into this form, "That ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge."

Not only are we to be strengthened by the Holy Spirit so that the mystery of the Christian life may be completely realized in us; but we are to be made able also to know and apprehend the mystery in which we are to be comprehended. Not only are we to be so changed as to reflect the perfect beauty and glory of God for the admiration of angels; but we are to be made able to see and enjoy the glory ourselves.

We are to be made able to apprehend the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. One naturally asks, to what breadth, and length, and depth, and height does the apostle refer? There is a breadth and length which spreads out before us in the external world. The scientist goes out upon the broad expanse of nature, and he discovers mysteries written all over the face of the universe. By many an earnest wrestle he has compelled nature to yield up many of her secrets, until he has harnessed the strength of the ocean and made the lightning do his bidding; yet wherever he has made a step in advance, he has seen the breadth and length of wonder and of mystery expand before him. So there are depths by which we are confronted, both without and within. With the motto, that "the proper study of mankind is man," the philosopher has stood beside the deep which opens to our gaze in the human spirit; and he has there found mysteries,

"Before which our mortal nature
Doth tremble like a guilty thing surprised;"

and he has been forced to the confession again and again that his intellect has no plummet capable of sounding the depths.

The astronomer, not content with the mysteries which surround him on the earth, has mounted aloft; and with the aid of telescope and spectroscope he has measured and analyzed the sun and the stars. Taking the distance which separates us from the sun in the grasp of his imagination as his measuring rod, he has started out to measure other suns many thousand and million times as far away, until even the imagination sinks back oppressed by the dizzy height. And as he has swept along through space he has thrown interrogation marks all over the immensities of space. Are these the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, which we are to be made able to comprehend? Yes; doubtless the time will come when we will know all these. But St. Paul has evidently in mind a breadth, and length, and depth, and height, which are above and beyond all these,—even the breadth and length, and depth, and height of him who made them all, and who continually upholds them by the word of his power. We shall see him as he is, and we are to know him and his love, which passeth knowledge.

Is it the aim of the church then to teach us all this? Let us not lose sight of the manner in which St. Paul makes his statement. He prays that we may *be made able* to comprehend and to know; the Revised Version puts it, "that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, *may be strong* to apprehend and to know." It is not the aim of the church primarily to teach science; but it is her mission to bring us into such a condition that we may have strength to apprehend and to know. She is to restore us to such right relations and to give us such spiritual strength, that we shall be able to apprehend the mysteries of God, whether they are revealed in nature or in his word. This accords with the history of the church and of science in the past. Though the advances in science are not to be credited, as a rule, directly to the church; yet the new life and vigor, which have come into the world with the church, have no doubt furnished the inspiration and motive for the advancement which has been made.

St. Paul, however, not only points us to the fact that the aim

of the church is to enable us to attain to such transcendent knowledge; he also points us to the condition on which such knowledge is possible. That condition is that we be rooted and grounded in love. "That ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge."

The possibility of knowing is here conditioned on something back of the intellect in the will. To say the least, this is not in accordance with the way in which men ordinarily look at the subject, nor in accordance with the way in which the subject is treated in our ordinary psychologies. Ordinarily we look upon the act of cognition as an immediate act of the intellect, and that all that is necessary is that the mind should be confronted by truth and reality. There seems to be an idea in the popular mind, at least, that man naturally possesses the ability of knowing the truth, when he sees it; and that all that is necessary is that we should be confronted by truth and reality and apply ourselves to it, in order to have a perfect knowledge of it. But such is certainly not the teaching of Jesus nor of St. Paul. Jesus makes our knowing depend on our doing. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself." (John 7: 17.) He charges the Jews with being unable to understand his word, because they had placed themselves into alliance with the devil. "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye can not hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." (St. John 8: 43, 44.) Because it was their will to do the lusts of the devil, therefore they were unable to know or understand his word. And with this agrees this statement of St. Paul. Not every one will attain to the ability of comprehending the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, or of knowing the love of Christ; only those who are rooted and grounded in love.

This presents to us a very interesting psychological problem.

How can the will affect and determine our knowledge? How can love be a necessary condition for knowing the truth? Often we think that we must know the truth in order that love may be awakened in the heart. How can the opposite be established, as is here affirmed?

Possibly we may get on the right track for solving the problem, if we keep in mind that knowing is not a simple but a complex activity. There are two factors to be taken into consideration, and at least two conditions necessary. There must be truth to be known and the mind to know. The existence and presence of the former is a necessary condition; but the existence and healthy activity of the latter is no less necessary. That I may see, light as an external fact is a necessity; but a healthy eye is no less a necessary condition. Sight is impossible except as there is a susceptibility in the eye to be affected by the waves of light. Each sense has such a susceptibility for certain knowledge, and for that only. For this reason we can neither see sound, nor hear light. It is just so with our knowing the truth. Not only must the truth be at hand as an objective fact for the mind, but the mind must be so attuned that it shall be able to respond to the truth and recognize it as truth. There must be an inner susceptibility of being affected by the truth in order that the mind may have an apprehension of it. Where the mind is not in accord with the truth, it can no more perceive it as the truth, than an organ of sense, as the ear, which is not in accord with the light, can perceive the light as light.

But that quality of the soul which brings it into accord with the truth is love. The fundamental attribute of God's character is love. Hence to know Him as truth, there must be in the soul that which enables it to respond to that fundamental attribute of his being. Hence to know him as he is, we must be rooted and grounded in love. Without that condition, we can not know his love; and without knowing his love, we can not know the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of his being and thought; and without knowing that, we can not know

the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, which he has set before us in the outward universe. Hence without this fundamental disposition of the will, we can not know aright anything by which we are confronted in the outward universe by which we are surrounded. We may know things in part; but we can not know them in their right relation; and so ultimately we will find ourselves to be mistaken with regard to all. What we do seem to know will turn out at last to be but empty show and dream.

We can thus see what the Church, as the kingdom of God's grace, has to do with science. As said above, it is not the mission of the Church to teach science as such; but it is her mission, as the bearer of God's grace to the hearts of men, *to enable them to know*, to bring them into the condition where they shall have strength and ability to comprehend the mysteries of God. And hence her mission on earth can not be reached till all the saints shall have been brought into this condition.

III. We have, however, not even yet reached the end. Our being strengthened with might in the inner man, Christ's dwelling in our hearts, and our being made strong to apprehend and to know,—all are to an end still beyond. It is that we may "be filled with all the fulness of God."

This statement involves more than usual difficulty. How can a finite being be filled with all the fulness of the infinite God? If I were to stand on the shores of the great Pacific, and if I should be told to fill a cup in my hand out of the fulness of the mighty ocean, I should understand the command, and should have power to execute it; but if I were told to pour all the fulness of the great ocean into the insignificant cup in my hand, a task would be laid upon me which I should be unable to fulfill. So if St. Paul had said that we should be filled out of the infinite fulness of God, we could very readily understand his meaning; but when he affirms that we, insignificant creatures of the dust, shall be filled with all the fulness of God, he confronts us with a mystery which it is difficult for us to grasp. It is true, a modification has been suggested in the translation, so as

to do away with the preposition "with," making the statement read, "that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God." (R. V.) But that hardly lessens the difficulty; for it is still implied that the fulness of God shall in some way find a place in us.

Shall we say that this is impossible, that this can not be the meaning of St. Paul? Yet is it not implied in the statement which has already been made, that Christ shall dwell in our hearts? We have no difficulty in accepting the statement of St. Paul in regard to Christ, that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." But if he abide in the heart as a personal and permanent guest, is it not implied that with him all the fulness of the Godhead must also abide in us? St. Paul seems to imply as much where he makes that statement in Col. 2: 9; for he immediately goes on to say, "and in him ye are made full." (R. V.)

Man was originally created in the image of God. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." (Gen. 1: 26, 27.) This statement is unqualified. Not only did God create man in his image in some one particular or aspect of his being; but in the totality of his being, he is the image and likeness of God. It is true, this image has become marred by the fall; yet it has not been destroyed, and will again be restored through the processes of redemption. Hence the only adequate ideal for man's life is to be found in God. In nothing lower can we find a satisfying model. Instinctively has humanity recognized the fact that the development of all the powers of manhood carries us upward to the divine. The perfect man must also be God. Hence the standard, which the Saviour has set for our life, is the perfection of God. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (St. Math. 5: 48.) That does not mean, perfect simply in mind, or perfect simply in moral conduct, but perfect in the totality of being. We are to be filled up with every grace and virtue, until each is a perfect image and likeness of the corresponding virtue in the

being of God. This much seems to be implied in the statement of St. John, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, *we shall be like him.*" (1 John 3: 2.) We shall then have bodies like unto his own glorious body. To this we readily give our assent, because this is plainly taught. "Who shall change our vile body, that it shall be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3: 21.) But will any affirm that our being like him is limited to this changing of our bodies into the likeness of his glorious body? Nay, this is only a presumption that we shall be like him also in all other respects. We shall be like him mentally, "for we shall see him as he is." We shall also be like him morally, for we shall be perfectly holy even as he is holy. So far there seems to be but little difficulty. Surely, if we are to be like him, we will be like him in these respects. But of him we readily admit that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Shall we say that we are to be like him in every other respect, but not in this? Logically we seem to be driven to affirm that we shall be like him even in this; and this statement of St. Paul, "that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God," seems to demand no less. As his perfect image, we shall be made to reflect all the perfections of his being and character. We shall be filled up with all the perfections of his grace and glory.

When this end shall have been attained in all the saints, then shall the aim of the Church also have been realized. When every living stone in the grand edifice of the temple of our God shall thus be made to reflect all the perfections of God, then shall it indeed be "his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." But so long as any of the living stones which compose that building shall reflect less than his perfect beauty and glory, so long will the aim and end of the Church remain unrealized.

It is true that when we look at the Church as it now is, or at

the life of the saints as they now are, it seems impossible that such an ideal should ever be realized. Yet that is the ideal set before us. It is, of course, idle to dream that an ideal so high and lofty shall be realized in the few short years allotted to the life that now is. It is impossible to attain it even in this present order; but in the unfolding of the mystery of God's providence, it will be reached. It can not be attained until "the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." The revealing of the sons of God must wait on the revealing of the Son of God; but "when he shall appear, we shall be like him." Hence we may well look for the "blessed hope," as well as hasten "unto the coming of the day of God."

V.

ON THE EARLY RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

THE Puritan settlement of New England was made by men who held at first two entirely distinct views as to the Reformation of the Church. The men of Plymouth, 1620, were the Come-outers of that time. They held that all established Churches were of the devil, that the only true Church was the voluntary union of the believers in Christ on the basis of the New Testament. They also rejected the liturgy which reminded them too much of Romanism. They were true Congregationalists—the first of that name in history. On the other hand the later Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1628, was formed by Puritans proper, that is members of the Church of England, who believed in and loved that Church, who had no objection to an established Church, but who desired the Reformation of the Church to proceed much farther than it had under Elizabeth. They desired all forms and ceremonies abolished which suggested anything of Popery, they desired the doing away of all offices, like of those of Archbishops, Archdeacons, etc., which had no countenance in the New Testament, and they desired the reformation of doctrine after the pattern of Geneva. But this radical Reformation the authorities in England were by no means inclined to carry forward; in fact, they were much rather inclined to a reactionary policy in the direction of the old Catholic regime with its severity and ceremonial uniformity. So England became a place too hot for both parties. Especially for the Pilgrim Congregationalists, who had formed their first

church at Scrooby, in Nottinghamshire, thence removed to Leyden, in Holland, and thence to America.

This fact, however, presents itself that whenever these two separate and distinct schools of immigrants became well established in Massachusetts, they came together on a common basis of church polity, and that polity was not the Puritan churchmanship of Endicott and his followers, but the independent position of Brewster and the Plymouth colony. The far-seeing mind of John Robinson, the Pilgrim pastor at Leyden, who did not accompany his flock across the Atlantic, saw this result. "There will be no difference," he said, "between the Conformable ministers and you when they come to the practice of the ordinance out of the Kingdom of England." Freed from the fear of the English Bishops and from the trials of the Star Chamber Courts, it was natural that the Puritan Colonists should establish a religion in which the dreaded and hated Episcopacy should be left out. As Bancroft remarks, "Episcopacy had no motive to emigrate, it was Puritanism almost alone that came over, and freedom of Puritan worship was necessarily the purpose and result of the colony." When Skelton and Higginson were sent over as the ministers of the Salem colony, they were set apart to their office by the church as though no other authority was recognized but the local church. A solemn day of fasting and prayer was set apart by the Governor. The new ministers, who had been ordained to the Church of England where they had exercised their ministry, were asked to give their views of the way in which God calls men to the ministry of the word. "They acknowledge there was a twofold calling; when the Lord moved the heart of man to take that calling upon him and fitted him with gifts for the same; the second, the outward calling, was from the people, where a company of believers are joined together in covenant to walk together in all the ways of the Lord." After this a vote was taken by ballot and Skelton was elected pastor and Higginson teacher, two offices which were soon combined into one. "They accepting the choice," in the words of a contemporary letter,

"Mr. Higginson and three or four of the gravest members of the church laid their hand on Mr. Skelton, using prayers therewith. This being done then there was imposition of hands on Mr. Higginson."* This was the first New England ordination, July, 1629, and by this step the Puritan churchmen of Massachusetts Bay forever cut themselves from the leading strings of the mother Church. But the most interesting part of the day's proceedings was the formal extending of fraternal good cheer on the part of the Separatists of Plymouth. The assistance of these men was desired on account of their larger experience in church government, and the position of both parties in the howling wilderness drew them together and made them look upon each other as brethren. A storm delayed the voyage of the delegates till the business was nearly over. "But later in the day"—and I quote here Dr. Leonard Bacon, "before the solemn rites of ordination were over, the messengers of the Plymouth Church, Gov. Bradford himself being one of them, came into the Assembly. They saw what had been going on, they heard the statement of what had been done—the mutual and public profession of the holy covenant, the free election by the church of its own officers, and then, in behalf of their own Church, they declared their approbation and concurrence. By them that elder church, cradled at Scrooby, nurtured and schooled at Leyden, and now at last victorious over the sufferings and temptations of the wilderness, greeted its younger sister in apostolic position with the right hand of fellowship. The church that had been brought over the ocean now saw another church, the first born in America, holding the same faith in the same simplicity of self-government under Christ alone. It had become manifest that in the freedom of this great wilderness there was no reason why the Separatists should separate from the Puritan, nor why the Puritan, who came 'to practice the primitive part of church reformation,' should purge himself from separatism. The first church formed in America was formed by a voluntary separation from the world and a

* See Leonard Bacon, *Genesis of New England Churches*, pp. 474 sq.

voluntary gathering into Christian fellowship. Its charter was the New Testament, and from that charter it deduced its right to exist and to govern itself by officers of its own choice and ordination. It acknowledged no King in Christ's Kingdom save Christ himself and no priest in the spiritual temple save the one High-Priest within the veil. Robinson had not lived to see that day, but he had foreseen it and his prophecy was fulfilled." *

I wish you to keep this fact in mind, as helping to understand the philosophy of American history, that the people of most of the colonies, in the formative period of our annals, were trained under a democratic rather than a prelatie form of church government, in which their responsibility to God alone was emphasized, and in which, even against their own will, they were brought up in habits of self-restraint, obedience to law, and in the love of liberty, independence and progress.

The word liberty reminds you of what at first seems an anomaly, that is, the absence of liberty in the constitution of the New England Colonies. These colonies were granted to the companies that received them by charters from the home government. It was in a sense a private transaction, and the immigrants had a perfect right to make such regulations as they deemed best for the carrying on of their estate. They came to America for a field for the free-working of their ideas of worship and government. That field was granted them and their rights within their charters were supreme. We have no more right to complain of their intolerance than we have to complain that our neighbor does not cultivate his farm or train his family according to our ideas. If it be said they did not believe in universal religious toleration, it must be answered, very true, they did not believe in it; they thoroughly disbelieved in it. In this respect they were not ahead of their age. At this time there was no state in the world which granted complete religious tolerance. Besides, they had this additional excuse, that what an old country might do with impunity might not be safe for an infant colony, whose very existence enemies in the old world

* *Ibid.*, pp. 476, 477.

were seeking an excuse to destroy. The colonists, therefore, sought to secure their own liberties, and were most jealous of anything which might put them in jeopardy. At the very beginning, in 1629, two persons protested against the Salem Church and set up a worship of their own, using the Prayer Book. They were sent back to England instantly. As one has said, "A conventicle of a score of persons using the liturgy might be harmless; but how long would the conventicle be without its surpliced priest; and when he had come, how far in the distance would be a bishop, armed with the powers of the High Commission Court."

The case of Roger Williams has caused a great deal of discussion. He arrived in Massachusetts, in 1631, a graduate of Cambridge University, and an Independent after Barrowe's own heart. He was a man of the most exalted type of piety and most conscientiously attached to his own views. Those views he announced both in season and out of season, and in a spirit by no means conciliatory and peaceful. It is hard to see how the colony could do otherwise than to banish him when we consider their situation. He held that the colony must cut off all connection with the Church in England as an anti-christian body, and that they ought to repent of ever having heard a parish minister in England preach. Not only so, but the king had no right to grant the patent for the colony, and he claimed that the cross should not be allowed on the royal ensign. Nor should an oath be administered to colonists who did not profess to be converted. It does not appear that the advanced views of Williams on toleration had anything to do with his banishment, or at least if it had, that was a very subordinate reason for the colony getting rid of the determined preacher. What appears to us the harsh dealings of Massachusetts with Roger Williams, the Quakers, and Anne Hutchinson, were really prompted by the instinct of self-preservation. The story of the Quakers is a sad one, but it was not the Quakers of the Lucretia Mott type with whom the colonists had to deal, but rather wild enthusiasts, who walked through the streets naked as a sign.

The founders of New England had not indeed attained to Locke's noble principle of toleration, a toleration which was embodied in Williams' Colony of Rhode Island and Lord Baltimore's Colony of Maryland, but in this respect they were not a whit behind the great colonies of Virginia and New York, and they were so far in advance of the old country that they reduced the number of capital offences from thirty-one to twelve.

Another point to be mentioned in the religious history of New England is the thoroughly religious character of the Commonwealth. It was founded by religious men for a religious purpose. The colonists were confessors of the faith. Everything was therefore ordered, from this point of view. Only the regenerate could be members of the church. Only church members could vote and hold office. The Governor and the members of the House of Deputies must be members of the church, but they must also be regenerate men, for church membership was also a qualification in England. In all the New England Colonies, except Rhode Island, it was the sacred duty of the Government to see that all abuses in church affairs and all heresy and schism should be suppressed. The theory of the Government was, rule by the best men. The church was supported out of the public treasury. Everyone had to attend church. Religious, as well as civil, offences could be punished as crimes. In 1631 the law was passed: "To the end that the body of the Commons may be preserved of honest and good men, it is ordered and agreed that for the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of the body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same." It was this positive religious complexion of the colony which inspired those severe laws against heresy and heretics of which there has been so much complaint. The religious tone of the population is seen in nothing better than their relish for religious services. In bare, cold churches, the wind whistling under the rafters, the people assembled to listen to sermons an hour or two hours long, preceded by prayers from fifteen

minutes to an hour in length, interspersed with the music of David's psalms lined off and droned through in the most solemn manner. Some men from Friesland visited Boston about 1680, and they thus described a service they attended on a fast day: "We went into the church where in the first place a minister made a prayer in the pulpit of full two hours in length, after which an old minister delivered a sermon an hour long, and after that a prayer was made and some verses sung out of the Psalms. In the afternoon three or four hours were consumed with nothing except prayers, three ministers relieving each other alternately; when one was tired the other went up into the pulpit." The story is told by Dr. Dorchester that a certain preacher of that olden time, after preaching for over an hour, turned his hour glass over and went on. When he had gone three-fourths of another hour, the congregation had nearly all retired, and the clerk, tired out, interrupted the minister with the request that when he got through with his sermon, he lock up the church and put the key under the door, as he and the rest of the people were going home.* Whether this story is true or not, it seems to be a solitary instance. As a rule the congregations enjoyed these services intensely, and listened to the lengthy and often profound and learned disquisitions of their ministers with keen attention. Their discourses were discussed at home during the week, and their points were debated pro and con in every shop and farm and over every table and quilting frame. The civilization of New England was laid by men in whom the fear of God and the love of his truth was engrained in the innermost fibre of their being.

One more: I notice the pre-eminence of their clergy. They were in reality, if not in form, the chief officers of the state. Their opinions on all questions were of the utmost consequence. They had not the slightest hesitation in haranguing the people on their political duties. When in 1632 the deputy governor Dudley had a grievance against Governor Winthrop, he made complaint to two ministers, who convened a council of their

* Christianity in the United States (New York, 1888), p. 166.

brethren to wait on the parties in the dispute. They then went apart for an hour, and when they gave their decision the Governor meekly submitted. To speak ill of ministers was a serious offense. In 1636 a man was fined £40, and compelled to make a public apology, because he said that all the ministers of Boston but three preached a covenant of works. This leadership was richly deserved. The ministers of New England were, for the most part, men of noble life, lofty intellect, and profound learning. Pure, consecrated, self-sacrificing, learned, devout, wise men of affairs as well as men of prayer, they were princes among men. They knew their power, they magnified their office, but they never abused it. "For once in the history of the world," says Professor Moses Coit Tyler, "the sovereign places were filled by sovereign men. They bore themselves with the air of leadership; they had the port of philosophers, noblemen and kings. The writings of the earliest times are full of reference to the majesty of their looks, the awe inspired by their presence, the grandeur and power of their words.* The clergy of New England were the glory of the New World. It was impossible that with such men as the leaders and guiders and inspirers of the people the future of this land could be otherwise than glorious. The people trained to rugged thought, used to grappling with difficult problems, held their ministers to their very best work. The church presented the appearance of a company of theological students, as nearly everyone had his note book with him and took as copious notes as he could of the sermon. "Hardly anything was lacking," says Professor Tyler, "that could incite a strong man to do his best continually, to the end of his days; and into the function of preaching, the supreme function in that time in popular homage and influence, the strongest men were drawn. Their pastorships were usually for life; and no man could long satisfy such listeners, or fail soon to talk himself empty in their presence, who did not toil mightily in reading and thinking, pouring ideas into his mind even faster than he poured

* *Hist. American Literature*, (New York, 1878). I., 138.

them out of it."* Thus ministers and people constantly stimulated and helped each other. Is it any wonder that with such ministers and people God was training the country for liberty, and guiding New England to that leadership in politics and religion, in learning and literature, in missions and reforms, which has made her the saving leaven of a vast and heretogeneous population, the guiding star of a mighty nation.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 191, 192.

VI.

ON READING.

BY PROF. J. B. KIEFFER, PH.D.

THERE is a very widespread misconception, not in our country only, but among civilized peoples generally, as to the purpose and function of schools of higher education, and in connection with discussions pertaining to them you doubtless have heard much unqualified nonsense about the self-made man. Now we certainly may make allowance for his existence so far as to admit that the whole world is a school, and it may very well be that a man who owes little or nothing to the class-room and the text-book may have a better certificate of education than even the average of those who hold diplomas from reputable modern colleges. But it is somewhat hard to see how this makes him more truly a self-made man than is he who owes much to the careful correction and discipline of the class-room. Both the one and the other trains himself for the duties of life by securing for himself the benefits arising from the accumulated experiences of the world. In fact all men, schoolmen as well as others, are self-made. No teacher, or text-book, or class-room, or system of education, can, by any species of juggling with opportunity and capacity, or the want of them, relieve an individual man of that supreme obligation. Moreover it is the better part of an education which a man gives himself. As neither a teacher nor a school can exercise his arms or his legs for him, so neither the one nor the other can force his mind into the kind of energetic action and struggle which is calculated to impart to it the glow of conscious power and enjoyment. It is indeed, natural to expect—and past experience

justifies the expectation—that he who enjoys leisure for study, and the guidance and stimulation, as well as warning, of men who have experienced the hardships and disappointments of the process which we call education, will find himself more effectively disciplined than those who grope through the dark ways of self-development unaided. But the only difference between the two would seem to be that the one, consciously or unconsciously, has ascertained and found it possible to avail himself of the world's organized wisdom, and the other for some reason has not.

Now of this education which a young man gives himself the reading of books is, and always has been, one of the chief constituent parts, and one in which it is, perhaps, easier to make mistakes than in anything else. For the true book is no easier to find than the true man, and "the art of right reading is as long and difficult to learn as the art of right living." For the bad book is as ubiquitous and obtrusive as the bad man, and the enormous multiplicity of modern books renders the task of choosing much more appalling than it ever was before. More than one hundred and fifty years ago Bishop Butler wrote: "The great number of books and papers of amusement which, of one kind and another, daily come in one's way, have in part occasioned, and most perfectly fall in with and humor this idle way of reading and considering things. By this means time, even in solitude, is happily got rid of without the pain of attention; neither is any part of it more put to the account of idleness, one can scarcely forbear saying is spent with less thought, than a great part of that which is spent in reading." And ever since he so wrote the cataract of printers' ink has never ceased to deluge the intellectual world with a persistency and complacency so unfaltering that both the pleasure and the profit of reading seem barely able to survive. "What are the books which it is vital for a young man to know?" has therefore been an important question to the students of any country and of any age. But I am inclined to think that it is a question of far more importance and significance to the students of

to-day and to the students of America than to those of any other age or of any other country. And the reason is plain to him who reads history with understanding. Surely it was not a mere chance that this continent, stretching from pole to pole amid the vast waste of waters, remained unknown to the world until fourteen hundred and ninety two years after Christ. The problems of human life which brought wisdom and suffering to the old world had exhausted both the sagacity and the powers of the men who struggled with them. Apparently it would have been impossible for those men or their descendants to carry those problems further than the stadium they had reached when Columbus sailed from Palos. China, as you know, so truly stands for the negation of the individual that the Chinaman first counts for something when he is dead; India can only think of the individual as an element of universal absorption; and Egypt, on the banks of her life-giving stream, broods in unending questionings about the mystery of life, and loses herself in riddles which she cannot solve, or even hope to solve. In Greece first men "walked in the light," as Euripides says, and in perpetual youth rejoiced in their conscious manhood. This was the birth and childhood of the individual. Its youth was disciplined by the rigorous morality of Rome, and its manhood trained in suffering amid the changing growth of Teutonic races. If now the development, or evolution, of the human individual had been the sole purpose of the creation of man, we might conceive that the progress of the race could have been brought to its fruition and close in Europe. But the perfection of the human race, as the "glorious consummation of nature's long and tedious work," involved, without doubt, another quite different and more difficult line of development. That "none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself" is more than a theological dogma. Man never is complete in himself, but finds his completion in a proper correlation with his fellowman. So that, as love is the fulfilling of the law, the apt adjustment of each individual to his fellow in a wisely organized human society is a farther advance towards the per-

fection of humanity than is the evolution of the individual. And this farther stadium of advance the nations of the old world, it seems to me, could not have fully achieved, and for the following reason. The ideas of individual right which they had developed during the long centuries which intervened between the battle of Marathon and the discovery of America gave rise to rivalries, antagonisms, and suspicions so great and so deeply rooted that nation was bound to nation not by sympathy, but by necessity, and international alliances were alliances not of principle, but of expediency. In such a constitution of society diplomacy was the only thing of supreme virtue, and the armed hand the only law; might made right, and the successful lie was the crown of life.

That a new world whose existence had hitherto been unknown, or had only been dreamed of in the visions of poets and seers, should be discovered at such a crisis in the world's history we must undoubtedly consider a revelation of divine wisdom. And although at first, and of necessity, precisely the same conceptions of the individual as had prevailed in the old world were imported into and maintained in the new, constituting the basis of all private and public action, it was not long until a reorganization of society, such as had been dreamed of and even attempted in Europe, began to grow into notice as the coming problem of the world. And it was your forefathers' declaration that all men are created equal, and their almost prophetic selection of a motto for the coming nation—*e pluribus unum*—that announced the inauguration of the movement. It is a matter of history, too, how completely our civil war closed the door upon the undue elevation of the individual; and the prayer of Mr. Lincoln that "the government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth" was the dedication of America to the work of cointegrating mankind in a social compact whose law shall never again be "*Every man for himself.*"

Now above all other forms of national life the democratic has most to fear from a false individualism,—from a social con-

dition in which all the units stand antagonistically apart from one another, and in which in both private and public life the appeal continually is to self-interest and not to social bonds and social duties. For it is not true that he who cares for himself cares also for his fellow-man. Much nearer the truth is the assertion that he who cares aright for his fellow-man cares best for himself. As the typical representative of the democratic idea in the modern world, our country will have to lead the way in the work of this social regeneration, and it is being driven to it at the present moment by most irresistible forces. There is a far deeper meaning in railroads and telegraphs than that they help man to satisfy his physical wants; and the public sentiment in the matter of syndicates, trusts, and monopolies, shows that there is present in our midst a very different conception of the rights and duties of wealth, both in its acquisition and its use, from that which was wont to prevail in the old world. Moreover the fact that socialism, in some form or other, has been accepted as a basis of thought and action by many Christian men and women, and even by some of the younger clergy, in America, is a proof that the discontent of the laboring classes, as expressed in socialism, trades-unions, labor amalgamations, co-operative associations, and so forth, is recognized as resting on some positive and solid basis, and as being fully justified by the inequality in life produced by an aggressive and unfeeling assertion of the rights of the individual to the full exercise and enjoyment of whatever power or wealth he can, justly or unjustly, appropriate, irrespective of any claims his fellow-man may have upon him and his. In other words, men are beginning to see that the unrest and discontent of the masses is really indicative of an upward movement and a conscious groping after better things. And we may be sure that it will have to be dealt with in a larger and more liberal spirit than it was in the days of Solon, or of the secession of the plebs to the Mons Sacer. To a much greater extent than ever before the masses now consist of educated men, and whatever solution they may reach to the problems

with which they are struggling will be a permanent realization of the possibilities of a larger life. Capital, so far as it is based on unrighteous principles, may cheat and delude them often; but capital has here the testimony of history before it, and may rest assured that the struggle will never end as it selfishly may hope to make it end. Sooner or later it will lead to a reconstruction of society on the basis of a correlation of its individual members as they never have been related before.

This, I think, is the problem to the solution of which young men in America during the coming generations must chiefly address themselves. That it is a much more complex problem than ever confronted the young men of any other age, and will require a greater diversity of gifts and a more truly liberal preparation for its adequate solution than any other, it is easy to see. It affects no single race or class of men, and is not confined, either in its operations or its results, to the immediate present. It is a world movement, alike in extent of space and duration of time, and for a season will find its chief centre here in America. Steam and electricity have prepared the way for it. They have reduced space and abbreviated time. They have made countless comforts possible; and in the food we eat and the water we drink, as well as the clothes we wear, they are assisting in the work of educating us to a recognition of the fact that our life belongs, not to ourselves, not to America, not to the nineteenth century, but to all mankind, and to eternity. The uses of these things are moral—for the sake of humanity and for the glory of God.

Under these circumstances the choice of a man's reading, as being part of his education is, indeed, a *very* serious matter. The precious hours will probably be few which any of you will be able to give to solid and earnest work with books, and the proportion of books that are not worth reading is to-day beyond computation. No wonder, therefore, that Mr. Lang felt himself called upon to advise any young man or woman interested in letters to read good books, and not to read newspapers and magazines,—meaning, it is to be presumed, that

they should not permit magazines and newspapers in any important or exclusive sense to constitute the material of their reading. The advice of Lord Sherbrooke not to mind what we read, assuming that the reading of good books will come when we have formed the habit of reading inferior books, surely is bad advice. And the same judgment must be pronounced on that of Mr. R. L. Stevenson, that to form a good style one should read anything and everything. Desultory reading is the bane of sound scholarship, and a standing menace to character. Mr. Lowell found it necessary to qualify the crudeness of the assertion that any reading is better than none by quoting the Yankee proverb which tells us that, "though all deacons are good, there's odds in deacons." "Desultory reading," he goes on to say, "hebetates the brain, and slackens the bow-string of will. It communicates as little intelligence as the messages that run along the telegraph wire to the birds that perch on it." To be tempted by a new title or a new cover, and to conceive that we must read abundantly of the ephemeral literature of the day to keep in touch with the spirit of the age, is a weak delusion, the only profit of which goes to the bookmaker and his publisher. Moreover, "the enormous power, vivacity, and speed in every department of exertion" which strike the foreigner so forcibly as the leading characteristics of our people, are additional reasons for care in such a matter. Time and reserved energy are more precious here and now than ever before, and a mistake in education is for us therefore a much more irreparable loss than it was for any other people.

What then shall we read while we are in the course of being educated, and even after the so-called completion of our education? Mr. Frederick Harrison undoubtedly is right when he says that "a healthy mode of reading will follow the lines of a sound education;" and that "the first canon of a sound education is to make it the instrument to perfect the whole nature and character;" that "its aims are comprehensive, not special;" that they "regard life as a whole, not mental

curiosity ;" and that " they give us, not so much materials, as capacities."—But Mr. Herbert Spencer, in discussing the same subject, assures us that the uniform reply to the question " What knowledge is most worth ?" is science, and gives us plainly to understand in what sense he takes science to be the reply to this question when he says : " For that indirect self-preservation which we call gaining a livelihood, the knowledge of greatest value is science." This view, promulgated by a man of transcendent ability, won its way into popular favor by its appeal to the pronounced utilitarianism of England, and of the modern world generally. It became the gospel of technical schools of every sort and description, and seemed to have the whole world before it as the scene of its triumphant progress. If it were correct we should have to say that the mental food best fitted to the digestion of all classes of men, and therefore the best course of reading for all classes of men, is science,—meaning thereby science in its applications to use. But though we may agree with Mr. Spencer when he says that science underlies sculpture, painting, music, and poetry, and that the facts of science are not in themselves unpoetical, we are not therefore bound to accept his conclusions. For all these things may be scientific in the sense of not being contrary to reason, without being either interpretable or communicable by science. They may include science, but not be included in science. For if Mr. Hugh Miller's works on geology, or Mr. Lewes's "*Seaside Studies*," do reveal a poetic power and capacity on the part of their authors, the poetry may exist there in spite of the science, and be due, indeed, to the same higher cause which made the science itself possible. The Greek who first told the beautiful story of Prokris and Kephalos surely had as high an appreciation of the beauty of a dew-drop as the modern physicist has, even though he did not know what the physicist does that the sudden liberation of the force which holds the elements of the dew-drop together would produce a flash of lightning. And the admission of so great a scientist as Mr. Darwin that although in early life poetry, painting, and

music had given him great delight, in maturer age he had lost all taste for art ; that he had no use for poetry or religion, and that the grandest scenes had long lost the power to stir in him any feelings of wonder, admiration, and devotion, would seem to destroy the contention that scientific pursuits do in any direct and positive sense contribute to the enjoyment of what is beautiful, or to the practice of what is good. For the doctrine which Mr. Darwin held that conscience is only the capitalized experience of the human tribe, and that there is no such thing as absolute or immutable morality, if carried out in daily life to practical conclusions, would certainly result in the death of human virtue. It was doubtless because of these faults in the thinking on which Mr. Spencer's doctrine was based that the institutions of higher education, and the classes of society to which art and religion are fraught with so much meaning, were slow to accept the new view. Men opened again their Aristotle and found that from of old the object of life was, not merely to live, but to live *well* ; that this living well was not an individual matter only, but depended on the relations of the individual to the past from which he sprang, and to the future which depends so much on him ; that it was a complex possibility involving ideals as well as facts, and hopes and duties as well as passions and pleasures ; that it will not suffer the individual to concern himself mainly with his own ego, nor permit the perversion of life into the desolation which follows close upon a rampant subjectivism. Mr. Spencer's work on education appeared thirty years ago, and his theory has been tested at such centres of learning as Oxford and Cambridge, as well as at the universities on the continent. "Investigations into the post university career of science scholars," says Mr. Glazebrook, "show that there is a very marked advantage on the side of those who had the more liberal education ;" that "the powers of observation, correlation, and inference are not as fully developed by science-training as was anticipated ; and that "the modern system seems to be after all but a system of imparting information,"—which is "the least part of knowledge."

These practical deficiencies in this view of education have, within the past few months, been summarized and emphasized in the admission of a scientist as great as Mr. Spencer that the law of the survival of the fittest will not account for the existence or the exercise of the highest powers of the human being. "Some day, I have no doubt," says Mr. Huxley, "we shall arrive at an understanding of the evolution of the æsthetical faculty; but all the understanding in the world will neither increase or diminish the force of the intuition that this is beautiful and that is ugly." "The practice of that which is ethically best," he proceeds, "involves a course of conduct which, in all respects, is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In place of ruthless self-assertion, it demands self-restraint; in place of thrusting aside and treading down all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but shall help his fellows; its influence is directed not so much to the survival of the fittest, as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive. It demands that each man who enters into the enjoyment of the advantages of a polity shall be mindful of his debt to those who have laboriously constructed it, and shall take heed that no act of his weakens the fabric in which he has been permitted to live." This surely is science come to its senses—this surely is science in agreement with religion and art—this noble declaration that the law of love, and not the law of strife—the law of self-restraint, and not the law of self-assertion—is the higher law of human progress. And the declaration that by the theory of evolution science explains humanity in part, but only in part, and that the good and the beautiful lie in a realm apart from it and beyond its reach, contains a truth full of meaning to schemes of education. It puts the greater weight not in an appeal to utility, but in an appeal to ethics and æsthetics, and finds of necessity therefore that the source of greatest power in education lies with the latter, and not with the former. Mr. Spencer's education is the education of a fanatical and rabid individualism, the education german to precisely that phase of society in which

modern European life seems to have culminated ; the education which shall be based on Mr. Huxley's view will be the education of a consciously organized social compact, or of that phase of society which the larger movements of the day seem to be ushering in, and for which young men are in duty bound to fit themselves, no matter in what profession their special work may have to be done.

It goes without saying, indeed, that the study of science, and and the scientific study of various branches of learning, must enter into any course of liberal education which is to meet the wants of the present age. It is not this which I am here concerned to gainsay, but only that view of the educative value of the study of science which is centered upon its utility, and which magnifies the value to education of the various processes of science and its countless formulas, its lists of facts and laws not linked together by any philosophical connection ; that view of the educative value of science which fails to see, as Mr. John Stuart Mills says, " that a man's mind is as fatally narrowed, and his feelings towards the great ends of humanity as miserably stunted, by giving all his thoughts to the classification of a few insects, or the resolution of a few equations, as to sharpening the points, or putting on the heads, of pins." Neither the brute scientific fact, nor the brute abstract law has any educative value. The fact must " appear as the incarnation of the highest and most universal laws, and the laws as worlds of truth enveloped and expressed in an infinite number of sensible facts." If this connection of the visible fact with the invisible laws of the beautiful and the good is not maintained in education, and the student's mind is made the register merely of sensible data with a view to future use, true education will perish, and with it will perish also even the possibility of the application of science to use. All progress needs and is inspired by ideals. This is true of science as well as of every other sphere of human exertion. Kepler beheld the sublimity of the planetary system before he discovered its laws, and Newton dreamed of a universal harmony before he realized what the law of grav-

ity is. All teaching which fails to realize and base itself on this truth in part at least misses its aim. Your linguist who deals only with optatives and iota-subscripts, with umlauts and subjunctive moods, with comparative phonetics and the law of analogy, is, indeed, a dry-as-dust, and makes his abode far from the haunts of men. Your mathematician, accustomed only to abstract reasoning, and not accustomed to observing and correlating the mixed data of real life—its hopes and fears, and joys and miseries—never reasons in ordinary affairs better than ordinary men, inasmuch as “the mathematical spirit is the art of seeing only one side of a question.” And your botanist—well, “if we lose a botanist we can get another,” as Fouillee says, “but if we lose a poet he is never replaced,” and this goes to the heart of the matter. So far as science enters into a scheme of education it, too, should be humanized, *i. e.*, its highest aim like all other efforts in education should be to excite wonder, admiration, reverence; to cherish sympathy and love, and to create enthusiasm and develop idealism. For even your physician, or your civil engineer, is a man and a citizen, and the world’s claim to his services is based on his being these first and chiefly, and not on his professional ability. And in these capacities a man needs that his whole nature shall be kept pure and noble and tenderly sensitive, and that his life shall be directed and moulded by lofty ideals, rather than that his powers as a man shall be lost amid the deluge of human miseries while he is pottering about pills, or his soul stupified by the poison of a selfish materialism while he is building bridges by the rule of thumb. And when science does this it comes so near to the sphere of the beautiful and the good that it is itself creative, and so falls within that definition of the universality of knowledge which Plato gives, when he says: *μηδέν ἐστιν ἀγαθὸν ὃ οὐκ ἐπιστήμη περιέχει*, there is no good thing which knowledge does not comprehend.

But if science in its general theories because they are beautiful, and not because they are useful, is capable of being used for the production of this idealism in human life, how much

more effectual for this purpose must those studies be whose chief function it is to deal with and to present the ideals of human life. The self-realization of man in his works must proceed primarily from that by which he is differentiated from all other existing things, and that is his ethical-esthetical nature—from that dual force in human life which the keen sense of the Greeks expressed with so much precision and power when they spoke of the cultivated man as *καλὸς καγαθός*.

These studies are history, literature, and philosophy. But of these there is again a gradation of value. For although we have come to know that "the vices and vicissitudes of kings and queens, and the dates of battles and wars" do not constitute the chief substance of history; but that "the development of human thought, and the progress of art, of science and of law" are vastly more interesting in the study of man, and vastly more valuable in the direction of human conduct, we cannot forget that history is the most external and superficial memory of communities. It is, indeed, an essential part of every scheme of education, and by right of merit is indispensable in every course of reading we may adopt. It gives us a sense of the unity of human life and effort, and, if attention is not concentrated on individuals, but on the moral and social conditions of a period, it throws into relief the positive and immutable principles which underlie human action; presents, as does Herodotus, whole galleries of unrealized subjects even for the artist's work, and so keeps before the student and the reader an ideal for human imitation. But this external and artificial record of man's life does not seize upon the taste, the tone, the sentiment, the opinion, and the character of men in the same profound and intimate way as literature. Literature has been called, and rightly called, a "living psychology," *humanity in miniature*. It is an introduction to the ideas and sentiments of a given age, or of the human race, working themselves out into concrete form. It is that part of the material of instruction which appeals first to imagination and sentiment, and deals with what acts on the heart and the character, instead of only on

the memory and the understanding and it is therefore, that portion of the material for our study and entertainment which is calculated primarily to rouse in us the faculty of wonder, to stir up feeling, to touch the heart, and so to sway the judgment in the direction of what is pure, delightful, true, and good. And we must not forget that, when its boundaries are properly enlarged, it includes such works as the Republic, the Apology, and the Phædo of Plato; the Politics and Ethics of Aristotle; the Analogy and the Sermons of Butler—that, in other words, it reaches over into the realm of that other study which, and which alone, can unify our efforts in science, in history, and in literature—and that is *philosophy*. A philosophy of science, a philosophy of morality, and a philosophy of society, are the essential complements to a course of liberal education. Without them our thinking and our acting are without order and harmony. But we do not need that this philosophy shall be a philosophy of materialism, a philosophy of psychophysics—a philosophy which shall make absolute certainty its aim. What we do need when we leave college, and while we are engaged in the duties of our vocation in life, is some criterion, some rule of faith, some doctrine of science and of life, to guide us among the conflicting and confusing influences at work in modern society. And this a study of philosophy, as the culmination of our education, gives us. And at the same time it brings us face to face with problems which cannot be solved, forces us to realize within ourselves that they are insoluble, and so creates within us an abiding sense of the absolute and eternal, and makes our education a loving and efficient handmaid to our religious nature.

But first in point of time and importance in a course of reading comes the poetical and emotional, not the historical or philosophical, side of literature. Men need that their imaginations shall be roused and fed, their feelings stirred and quickened, by the portrayal of human struggle and passion, before they are to begin to reflect and ponder over cause and effect. And they will be much mistaken if they imagine that the literature of

their own country, or their own age, is enough for a liberal education. It may be that there was a time when such a national monologue was possible; but if so, it had passed away long before the beginnings of recorded history. The Tell el Amarna tablets seem to show that even the literature and art of ancient Egypt were not of purely spontaneous growth; and if ever we shall be able to fill up with historical data the gap of two thousand years between the date of the first intercourse of the Greeks with the people of the land of the Nile and the days of Homer, we shall find that the art of Æschylus and Phidias was as truly a derived art as is that of Scott and Browning. But whether so or not, for us the case is clear. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Scott are only younger brothers in that family of artists whose ancient prime was graced by the authors of the Vedic hymns and the Litany of Accad. Nay, it even seems that native power and growth need foreign inspiration. St. Paul, we are told, was the first true successor of Aristotle, and the Christian church the crown of Roman history. In like manner an American author says, and says rightly: "Anglo Saxon literature, so far from being the mother, was not even the nurse of the infant genius which opened its eyes to the sun of England five centuries ago." The English epic and the English drama are the offspring of Homer and Virgil, of Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Menander and Diphilus, of Ennius and Pacuvius, of Plautus and Terence. And in the same way English Didactic, Lyric and Pastoral poetry find their original homes in Bœotia, Italy and Sicily. Nay, even of English prose, Thucydides, Plato and Demosthenes, Tacitus, Livy and Cicero are the acknowledged sources.

If now our course of reading is to follow the lines of a liberal education, it cannot ignore this truth. These ancient authors were the fathers of English literature, and had achieved for themselves that glorious distinction by moving mankind to the depths of their souls, and moulding human life on an ideal scale, ages before Chaucer knew his Boccaccio, or Barclay his Vergil. The assize of letters had placed them therefore far beyond the

reach of question as the greatest and the wisest of those who had peered into the mystery of life, and had been rapt in an ecstasy away by the sublimity of its heroism and the terror of its misery.

Taking poetry and higher fiction only, as supplying best the daily needs of our emotional being, it is not difficult to determine what should be the first and chief rule in our dealings with books. It is simply "*Read the best.*" For when you have read it and have made it your own—a possession inalienable through all your years—you will know who have been and are the great spirits of the human race, and you will gladden your heart in joy and in sorrow, in youth and in old age, in all the conditions and periods of your lives, with the inheritance they have bequeathed to you, their fellow-men. And that glorious people, the record of whose uninterrupted poetic fertility covers more centuries than does the literature of any other race, will furnish you with your first fruitful beginnings. For Homer is the very fountain head of pure enjoyment, of all that is fresh, simple, innocent and dignified—the "eternal type of the poet,"—in creative power comparable only to the three or four to whom has been vouchsafed in the highest degree and fullest exercise that clear poetic vision which makes poets the interpreters of humanity to all time. And what Homer is to Epic, that Æschylus is to dramatic art—"the first immortal type," whose Prometheus still is the most sublime of poems, and whose Agamemnon, "in majesty and mass of pathos, remains without a rival." Moreover who would wish his life to be untouched by the exquisite tenderness of an Antigone, or the soul's nobility of an Œdipus; or not to know him of whom Philemon sang:

"If as some say, men still in very truth
Had life and feeling after they are dead,
I had hanged myself to see Euripides."

So too, the wild, keen, subtle, daring, extravagant, boisterous and irrepressible Aristophanes—a spirit that measured all the stages from most unbridled and licentious farce up to most splendid bursts of lyric poetry—is "the eternal type of comedy."

And, even if it be true, as some say, that Livy is the only Homer that Rome ever knew, still the *Æneid* must forever hold a place in the world's eternal poetry for its grace alike of conception and of form; whilst Horace only fairly misses the perfection of those he imitates, and remains to us "in wit, grace, sense, fire and affection" beyond disparagement of criticism.

And if we come nearer to our own age we shall still find ourselves under the spell of master spirits not unworthy to company with those we have named, and shall still be moving along the lines of our own beginnings. For surely the horrors of the *Nibelungen Lied*—"that Thyestian tragedy of the North,"—and the gallantry of the Arthurian Cycle may well stand beside Ulysses' final struggle, and the death and burial of Old King Priam's son. These, along with the song of Roland and the Tale of the Cid, are the embodiments of the national genius of the west of Europe, as were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of pre-historic Greece. But what shall we say of that prophet, historian and philosopher with whose Divine Comedy modern poetry as Christian is ushered in—what of the Epics of Ariosto and Tasso, and of the lyrics of Petrarch? Here whole ages and whole races of mankind have been charmed, instructed and inspired, and the power of man to epitomize the life and labor of his kind handed on to races more remote in blood and temper from the men of Rome than they from those of Greece. And why should we know nothing of Corneille, Racine and the courteous, pure and manly Moliere? Or to take up what is said to be the only work of the Spanish imagination which has found rank amongst the great masterpieces of human creation, why should we leave the tender, humanly pitiful and sympathetic Cervantes either a closed book for ever, or nothing more than a collection of ridiculous episodes for boys to laugh over? Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton, Burns, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Wordsworth and Tennyson, each in his way, and each according to the measure of his ability, has left the world a vision of what man might be in startling contrast with what he is for our encouragement, guidance, warning and correction.

And so of prose romances, Fielding, Goldsmith and Defoe

had a more ambitious and glorious purpose than to cater to our amusement, or to put money into their empty pockets. Their transcripts of human nature, their pathos and dramatic power, rank them as poets in all but name, while the lessons they contain mark them as philosophers and benefactors for all time. And Scott, the last of the great creative spirits, of whom it has been said that "to have drunk in the whole of his glorious spirit is a liberal education in itself;" Scott who "lost himself in delighted observation and record," and so was great with something even of Homeric greatness,—who will measure for us the arena of human life which his works cover, or weigh with precision the amount of influence he has exerted in forming the character of the generations that have followed him? No course of reading which leaves his immortal works untouched can be thought to be complete, or to have given those for whom it was sketched the full measure of power over their lives which such a course should exert.

And this is but a section of what a course of reading should contain—but a small part of the greatest and best of the works of the great and good men of the world. To indicate in the same way what should be done in other departments would keep us much too long. Of this, however, we may be sure. To master the one hundred or more volumes which may contain the works which the world has adjudged immortal is a labor for our whole lives, and not only for the few years we shall spend at college. But, if it has not already begun when we come to college, it should begin with our first work in college,—I am speaking now of reading as collateral to, but independent of, our work in the several departments of study at college,—and it should begin with what I have indicated, with poetry and the higher kinds of fiction, as having most to do with exciting and stimulating that feeling of wonder through which alone the human being can be educated. And much of your guidance as to what further you shall read will come to you of its own suggestion, if the beginning is properly made, and the habit is fairly formed of reading only what is matchless and immortal. I say *habit* intentionally because this kind of reading is neither

easy nor attractive to the average young man, at first and necessarily. It requires an effort to so master one's self as to be in condition to enjoy these masterpieces. For it is easier and more tempting as an occupation to dawdle over the vapid monstrosities of a railroad station's news-stand than it is to read even Pope's translation of Homer,—easier to browse idly and insatiably amid the new novels which daily are overwhelming the world, than to rouse and fortify the will to the enjoyment of the Divine Comedy. For the noises and excitements of the artificial life we lead overbear and destroy natural enjoyment. What pleasure has the gambler in railroad stocks in the leafy woods and the tumbling hills in the joyous month of June? Even so little can he have in this ideal world, this land where the heroes dwell and gods still walk with men, whose mind is drugged with the slow-working but deadly poison of idle reading. To the generality of men to read and love good books is no more a natural gift than it is to do and love good deeds. It is, on the contrary, a faculty to be acquired by careful and constant training,—a priceless boon when achieved, but the result only of watchful self-mastery. The insatiable reader is by no means the best reader just as the crowding of the mind with multitudes of facts is not the best means of education. Especially at the outset of our training, thoughtful and systematic reading requires hard study. But as our recompense enjoyment at last lies about us on every hand, and we are in the garden of the gods. For, in the words of Richard de Bury, "these are the masters who instruct us without rods and ferules, without hard words and anger, without clothes or money. If you approach them, they are not asleep; if investigating, you interrogate them, they conceal nothing; if you mistake them, they never grumble; if you are ignorant, they cannot laugh at you."

But this is true only of the good books, only of those whose influence has sunk deepest into human nature and covered the widest scope of human action,—only of the works of genius which the common consent of mankind has adjudged beyond the reach of corrupting age, perishless and priceless for ever. And these books we should not be content to read once only,

for so no one can come to know them; nor to take it for granted that we have read them because we have read what other men have said about them. Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Scott, and Cervantes, together with all the other immortals, have a daily and lasting value. If profitable reading comes only by habit and conscious effort, profitable knowledge of these poets comes only by repeatedly and lovingly reading their works. Their music and their spirit must become part of our nature; and we must become part of the world they have created, and feel the inspiration of their ideals moving in our lives and impelling our wills.

But if this is to be done in addition to the reading demanded by the several departments of study in a college course, it is very evident that no time will be found for the species of literature which the ordinary news-stand offers us. For, even with the careful exclusion of all such material, and with the most judicious weeding out of newspapers and magazines, we shall find it almost impossible to avoid another grievous fault in our reading, and that is, allowing it to run into narrow and settled grooves. For, above all things, we should see to it, whether we read much or little, that it be general, and bring us into contact with various phases of life and a wide extent of thought. And in this you will have no unerring guide. You will have to find firm footing in the vast field of literature for yourselves. You yourselves will have to measure out your times and seasons and adapt your strength to your opportunity. It will suffice if in any degree what I have attempted to say shall help you to avoid an aimless wandering over a trackless waste; shall prevent you from attempting to read everything only to know nothing, and from spending the greater part of your leisure time in maundering over books which leave no mark,—aye, no mark, save that terrible stupor of the soul which will prevent you from hoping for anything larger, higher, nobler or purer than your present petty pleasure, and will render you forever unable to estimate the value of lofty ideals, or to commit the guidance of your life to geniuses who have had fellowship with all that is absolutely true, beautiful and good.

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

CHRISTUS CONSOLATOR, or Comfortable Words for Burdened Hearts. By Gilbert Haven. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1893. Price, \$1.25.

This volume consists of nine papers prepared for the press by Bishop Gilbert Haven of the Methodist Episcopal Church, just before his death thirteen years ago. They are now published by his son who recently revised the manuscript and added some notes which he thinks may be of interest to the reader. The papers were all originally prepared as sermons, and as such were preached at various places and on different occasions. They are without exception noteworthy on account of their pleasing style and striking thought, and are admirably suited to give comfort to burdened hearts. The subjects discussed in them are, "Two Greek Books on the Life Beyond," "God Hiding and Revealing Himself," "The World Vanishing," "Man Fails, God Abides," "Taking Children in His Arms," "Endurance—Happiness," "The Blessedness of the Blessed Dead," "The Christian Soldier," and "The Enigma Solved." Those seeking a book to comfort the afflicted and sorrowing will find this one especially deserving of their attention.

THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL EXPOUNDED. By Milton S. Terry, S.T.D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1893. Price, 75 cents, net.

There is given in this little volume not a commentary on the Book of Daniel, but a series of exegetical essays on the apocalyptic portions of the book. These essays have been prepared and published with a hope of correcting, to some extent, the unsound methods from which the author believes that the prophecies of Daniel have greatly suffered. The work as a whole is a master piece of exegesis. We have read it throughout with great interest, and would heartily commend it to all our readers who are at all interested in the prophecies which it aims to expound. Its expositions of the visions of the prophet, are indeed, most satisfactory. The book deserves to be widely circulated and read.

A STUDY OF THE BOOK OF BOOKS. By Rev. W. H. Groat. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1893. Price, 20 cents.

EXOGETICAL STUDIES. The Pentateuch and Isaiah. By Henry White Warren, D. D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1893. Price, 40 cents, net.

Both these little books are of the same order. They have been

prepared more especially for Epworth Leagues, Sunday School Assemblies, Intermediate Classes, Young People's Societies, Boys' and Young Men's Classes in Y. M. C. A. work, and Supplemental Lessons in the Sunday School; but they are also suited for use in the family and for private study. The first named is intended for those who have graduated from the primary department, and who are not yet sufficiently advanced for the normal class; the second is designed for more advanced scholars. Both books are well suited to the purpose for which they have been prepared, and it would be well if they, or similar works, were more used in our Sunday Schools generally. If such were the case our young people would soon be better informed concerning the Scriptures than they now are. In many of our Sunday Schools the instruction imparted from Sunday to Sunday is too disconnected and superficial to amount to much. The preparation of these exegetical studies is a hopeful sign, as it indicates a felt want for something better than what we have been having.

TWO LETTERS TO A MINISTER BY PAUL THE APOSTLE. A Biblical Study. By Bishop John H. Vincent. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1893. Price, 20 cents.

The publishers of this booklet are issuing a series of booklets called "The Book of Book Series," which presents a brief account of the different books of the Bible. To this series the little treatise before us belongs. In it Bishop Vincent gives a concise account of the character and teaching of the two Epistles to Timothy. "We may depend," he maintains, "upon these as the letters of Paul. They are full of his personality. This ardor and frankness, this penitence for the past, this joy of salvation in the present, this confidence as to the future, this condemnation of sin in every form, and this exaltation of truth and holiness are not the work of an imposter. They are true, according to every canon of internal evidence, to the Paul of the Acts and of the other Epistles. The work of no ancient classic author has such strong external and internal proof of its genuineness. The topography which is recognized, the opinions and social conditions of the times, both in the Church and in the world, the object of the writing, the themes discussed, the utter weakness of the impeachment, the weight of testimony from the ages, all sustain the claim as to Paul. We may be sure that these epistles are not a fraud." In his comments on the contents of the Epistles Bishop Vincent is generally very happy. Great truths are strikingly presented and sparkling thoughts are to be found on every page. Throughout, indeed, this little treatise will be found to be very suggestive and spiritually stimulating.

